

METHODISTS WRITE EARLY AMERICAN BISHOPS

To Dr Chandler.

London

April 28. 1788.

Rev^d & dear Sir.

As you are setting out for America, & I for a more distant Country, I think it needful to leave with you some Account of myself & my Companions thro' life. At 8 years old, in 1715, I was sent by my Father, Rector of Epworth to Westminster School, and placed under the Care of my Eldest Brother Samuel, a strict Churchman, who brought me up in his own Principles. In 1727 I was elected Student of Christ Church. My Brother John was then Fellow of Lincoln

The first Year at College, I lost in diversions. The next, I betook myself to Study. Diligence led me into serious Thinking. I went to the Weekly Sacrament, and persuaded two or three young Scholars to accompany me; and likewise to observe the Method of Study prescribed by the Statutes of the University. This gained me the harmless Nickname of Methodist. In half a year my Brother left his Curacy of Epworth, and came to our assistance. We then proceeded regularly in our studies, & in doing what God we could to the bodies and souls of men.

I took my Degree, & only thought of spending all my days at Oxford: But my Brother, who always had the Ascendant over me, persuaded me to accompany him & Mr Oglethorpe to Georgia. I exceedingly dreaded entering into holy Orders; but he overruled me here also; and I was Ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Oxford one Sunday & the next Priest by the Bishop of London.

Our only Design was To do all the good we could, as Ministers of the Church of England, to which we were firmly attached both by Education & Principle. My Brother still acknowledges Her the best national Church in the world. In 1736 we arrived, as Missionaries in Georgia. My Brother took charge of Savannah, and I of

METHODISTS WRITE EARLY AMERICAN BISHOPS

To Dr Chandler.

London

April 28. 1785.

Rev^d & dear Sir.

As you are setting out for America, & I for a more distant Country, I think it needful to leave with you some Account of myself & my Companions thro' life. At 8 years old, in 1715, I was sent by my Father, Rector of Epworth to Westminster School, and placed under the Care of my Eldest Brother Samuel, a strict Churchman, who brought me up in his own Principles. In 1727 I was elected Student of Christchurch. My Brother John was then Fellow of Lincoln

The first Year at College, I lost in diversions. The next, I betook myself to Study. Diligence led me into serious Thinking. I went to the Weekly Sacrament, and persuaded two or three young Scholars to accompany me; and likewise to observe the Method of Study prescribed by the Statutes of the University. This gained me the harmless Nickname of Methodist. In half a year my Brother left his Curacy of Epworth, and came to our Episcopate. We then proceeded regularly in our studies, & in doing what good we could to the bodies and souls of men.

I took my Degree, & only thought of spending all my days at Oxford: But my Brother, who always had the Ascendant over me, persuaded me to accompany him & Mr Oglethorpe to Georgia. I exceedingly dreaded entering into holy Order; but he over-ruled me here also; and I was Ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Oxford one Sunday & the next Priest by the Bishop of London.

Our only Design was To do all the good we could, as Ministers of the Church of England, to which we were firmly attached both by Education & Principle. My Brother still acknowledges Her the best national Church in the world. In 1736 we arrived, as Missionaries in Georgia. My Brother took charge of Savannah, and I of

Fredricka: waiting for an opportunity of preaching to the Indians. I was in the meantime Secretary to Mr. Ogilthorpe, and also Secretary of Indian Affairs.

The hardships of being upon the ground &c soon threw me into a Fever and Dysentery, which forced me which forced me in half a year to return to England. My Brother returned the next year. Still we had no Plan but to serve God, and the Church of England. The lost sheep of this Fold were our principal Care; not excluding any Christians of whatever denomination, who were willing to add the Power of Godliness to their own particular Form.


Our Eldest Brother Isaac was alarmed at our going on, and strongly expressed his Fears of the ending in a Separation from the Church. All our enemies prophesied the same. This confirmed us the more in our Resolution to continue in our Calling; which we constantly avowed, both in publick & private, by word and preaching and writing: exhorting all our hearers to follow our example.

My Brother drew up Rules for our Society, one of which was, Constantly to attend the Church, Prayer and Sacrament. We both signed these Rules. & also our Hymnbooks.

When we were no longer permitted to preach in the Churches, we preached (but never in Church houses) in houses, or fields. & some from thence (or rather carried) multitudes to Church who had never been there before. Our Society in most places made the bulk of the Congregation, both at prayer and sacrament.

I never lost my Dread of a Separation, or used to guard our Society against it. I frequently told them, "I am your servant as long as you remain members of the Church of England; but no longer should you ever forsake Her, you would renounce me."

Some of our lay preachers very early discovered an inclination to separate, which induced my Brother to publish "Reasons against separation". As often as it appeared, we beat down the Schismatical Spirit.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

If any one did leave the Church, at the same time he left
our Society. For 50 years we kept the sheep in the fold,
and having fulfilled the number of our days, only wait
ed to depart in peace.

After our having continued Friends for above 70 years
and Fellow-labourers for above 50, can any thing but death
part us? I can scarcely yet believe that in his 82nd year,
my Brother, my old intimate Friend and Companion
should have assumed the Episcopal Character, Ordain-
ed Elders, Consecrated a Bishop, and ^{him} sent to ordain
the day-preachers in America! I was then in Bristol
at his Elbow; yet he never gave me the least hint of his In-
tention. How was he surprised into so rash an Action?
He certainly persuaded himself that it was right.

Lord Mansfield told me last year, that Ordination
was Separation. This my Brother does not and will not
see: or that He has renounced the Principles & Practice
of his whole life; that he has acted contrary to all his De-
clarations, Protestations, & Writings; robbed his friends of
their boasting; realized the Nag's head ~~the~~ Ordination;
and left an indelible Blot on his name, as long
as it shall be remembered.

Thus our Pastorship here is dissolved — but
not our Friendship. I have taken him for better
or worse, till death do us part — or rather re-unite
in love inseparable. I have lived on earth a little
too long, who have to see this evil day. But I shall
very soon be taken from it, in steadfast faith that the
Lord will maintain his own Cause and carry on his
work, & fulfil his promise to his Church. So, I am
with you always even unto the end of the world!

Permit me to subscribe myself

Rev^d and dear Sir,

Yours faithful & obliged Serv^t & Brother

Charles Wesley

P. 1.

What will become of those poor things in the wilderness, the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England, which their preachers and they no more intended than the Methodists here! Had they had patience a little longer, they would have seen a Real Primitive Bishop in America, duly Consecrated by Three Scotch Bishops, who had their Consecration from the English Bishops, and an acknowledged by them as the same with themselves. There is therefore not the least difference betwixt the members of Bishop Seabury's Church, and the Members of the Church of England.

You know I had the happiness to converse with that truly Apostolical man, who is esteemed by all that know him as much as by you & me. He told me, he looked upon the Methodists in America, as sound members of the Church, and was ready to Ordain any of their Preachers whom he should find duly qualified. His Ordinations would be indeed genuine, valid, and Episcopal.

But what are ^{your} ~~the~~ poor Methodists now? Only a New Sect of Presbyterians. And, after my Brother's death which is near so very near, what will be their end? They will ^{lose all they acquire} turn aside to vain, ^{and} ~~any thing~~ ^{they will} ~~of Dissension.~~ ^{and} come to nothing, like other sects.

A Letter from J. and D. Coke,
Right Reverend Sir

Permit me to intrude a little on your time upon a subject of great importance.

You, I believe, are conscious that I was brought up in the Church of England, and have been ordained a Presbyterian of that Church. For many years I was prejudiced even, I think, to bigotry in favour of it: but through a variety of causes or incidents, to mention which would be tedious and useless, my mind was exceedingly biased on the other side of the question. In consequence of this, I am not sure but I went farther in the separation of our Church in America, than M.^r Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend. He did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal Authority, but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place. He being pressed by our Friends on this side of the water for Ministers to administer the Sacraments to them, (there being very few Clergy of the Church of England then in the States) he went farther, I am sure, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed. And this I am certain of, — that he is now sorry for the separation.

But what can be done for a re-union, which I much wish for; and to accomplish which M.^r Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost? The affection of a very considerable number of the preachers & most of the people, is very strong towards him, notwithstanding the excessive ill usage he received from a few. My interest also is not small; and both his and mine would readily and to the utmost be used to accomplish ^{that} (to us) very desirable object; if a readiness were shewn by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church to re-unite.

It is even to your Church an object of great importance. We have now above 60,000 Adults in our Society in these States, & about 250 Travelling Ministers & Preachers; besides a great number of Local Preachers, very far exceeding the number of Travelling Preachers; & some of those Local Preachers are men of very considerable abilities. But if we number the Methodists as most people number the members of their Church, viz. by the Families which constantly attend the, Divine Ordinances in their places of worship, they will make a larger Body than you probably conceive. The Society, I believe, may be safely multiplied by five on an average to give us our states Congregations; which will then amount to 300,000. And if the calculation which, I think, some eminent writers have made, be just, that three fifths of mankind are un-adult (if I may use the expression) at any given period, it will follow that all the families, the Adults of which form our Congregations in these States, amount to 750,000. About one fifth of these are Blacks.

The work now extends in length from Boston to the South of Georgia; & in breadth from the Atlantic to Lake Champlain, Vermont, Albany, Redstone, Holstein, Kentucky, Cumberland, &c.

But there are many hindrances in the way. Can they be removed?

1. Our Ordained Ministers will not, ought not, to give up their right of administering the Sacraments. I don't think that the generality of them, perhaps none of them, would refuse to submit to a re-ordination, if other hindrances were removed out of the way. I must here observe that ^{between 60 and 70} ~~between 60 and 70~~ only out of the two hundred and fifty have been ordained Presbyters, and about 60 Deacons (only). The Presbyters are the choicest of the whole.

2. The other Preachers would hardly submit to a re-union, if the possibility of their rising up to Ordination depended on the present Bishops in America. Because tho' they are all, I think I may say, zealous, pious and very useful men, yet they are not acquainted with the learned Languages. Besides, they would argue, If the present Bishops would waive the Article of the Learned Languages, yet their Successors might not.

My desire of a re-union is so sincere and earnest that ^{these} ~~they~~ difficulties almost make me tremble: and yet something must be done before the death of M^r. Wesley, otherwise I shall despair of success: for tho' my influence among the Methodists in these States as well as in Europe is, I doubt not, increasing, yet M^r. Asbury, whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply: nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it.

In Europe, where some steps had been taken, tending to a separation, all is at an end. M^r. Wesley is a determined Enemy of it, and I have lately borne an open and successful testimony against it.

Shall I be favoured with a private interview with You in Philadelphia? I shall be there, God willing, on Tuesday the 17th of May. If this be agreeable, I'll beg of You just to signify it in a note directed to me at M^r. Jacob Baker's Warehouse, Market Street, Philadelphia. or, if you please, by a few lines sent me by the return of the Post at Philip Rogers's Esq^r. in Baltimore ^{from yourself or D^r. Magaw}; and I will wait upon You with my Friend D^r. Magaw. We can then enlarge on these subjects.

I am conscious of it, that secrecy is of great importance in the present state of the business, till the minds of You, Your Brother-Bishops, and M^r. Wesley, be circumstantially known. I must therefore beg that these things be confined to Yourself and D^r. Magaw, till I have the honour of seeing You.

Thus, You see, I have made a bold venture on Your Honour and Candour, and have opened my whole heart to You on the

subject as far as the extent of a small Letter will allow me. If You put equal confidence in me, You will find me candid and faithful.

I have, notwithstanding been guilty of inadvertencies. Very lately, I found myself obliged (for the pacifying of my conscience) to write a penitential Letter to the Rev^d M^r. Jarratt, which gave him great satisfaction: and for the same reason I must write another to the Rev^d M^r. Pettigrew. When I was last in America, I prepared and corrected a great variety of things for our Magazines, indeed almost every thing that was printed, except some loose hints which I had taken of ^{one of} my Journeys, and which I left in my hurry with M^r. Asbury, without ^{any} correction, intreating that no part of them might be printed which would be improper or offensive. But through great inadvertency (I suppose) he suffered some reflections on the characters of the two above-mentioned gentlemen to be inserted in the Magazine, for which I am very sorry: and probably shall not rest till I have made my acknowledgements more public; though M^r. Jarratt does not desire it.

I am not sure whether I have not also offended You, Sir, by accepting of one of the offers made me by You and D^r. Magaw of the use of Your Churches about six years ago on my first visit to Philadelphia, without informing You of our Plan of Separation from the Church of England. If I did offend, (as I doubt I did, especially from what You said on the subject to M^r. Richard Dallam of Abington,) I sincerely beg Yours and D^r. Magaw's pardon. I'll endeavour to amend. But, alas! I am a frail, weak creature.

I will intrude no longer at present. One thing only, I will claim from Your Candour — that if You have no thoughts of improving this proposal, You will burn this Letter, and take

no more notice of it (for it would be a pity to have us entirely alienated from each other, if we cannot unite in the manner my ardent wishes desire. But if You will further negotiate the business, I will explain my mind still more fully to You on the probabilities of success.

In the mean time permit me, with great respect, to subscribe myself,

Right Rev? Sir,

Your very humble servant in Christ

Thomas Coke

Richmond,

April 24. 1791.

The Right Rev?

Father in God, Bishop White.

You must excuse Interlineations, &c. as I am just going into the country, & have no time to transcribe.

The Original
 of a Letter to
 me from Dr
 Estlin, advising
 Publication in
 a Controversy
 with one in
 England.
 W. W. L.

The Right Reverend Father
 in God
 Bishop White
 Philadelphia

Bright Reverend Sir

From your well-known Character I am going to open my mind to you on a subject of very great moment.

Being educated a Member of the Church of England from my earliest Infancy, being ordained of that Church, and having taken two Degrees in Arts and two Degrees in Civil Law in the University of Oxford which is entirely under the Patronage of the Church of England, I was almost a Bigot in its favour when I first joined that great and good Man Mr. John Wesley, which is fourteen years ago. For five or six years after my Union with Mr. Wesley I remained fixed in my attachments to the Church of England: but afterward, for many reasons which it would be tedious and useless to mention, I changed my sentiments, and promoted a Separation from it as far as my influence reached. Within these two years I am come back again: my Love for the Church of England has returned. I think I am attached to it on a ground much more rational, and consequently much less likely to be shaken, than formerly. I have many a time ran into error; but to be ashamed of confessing my error when convinced of it, has never been one of my defects. Therefore when I was fully convinced of my error in the steps I took to bring about a separation from the Church of England in Europe, I delivered before a Congregation ^{of about 3000 people} in our largest Chapel in Dublin on a Sunday-evening after preaching an exhortation, which in fact amounted to a recantation of my error. Sometime afterwards, I repeated the same in our largest Chapels in London, & in several other parts of England & Ireland: & I have reason to believe that my proceedings in this respect have given a death-blow to all the hopes of a separation, which may exist in the minds of any in those Kingdoms.

On the same Principles I most cordially wish for a Re-union of the Protestant Episcopal, and the Methodist Churches in these States. The object is of vast magnitude. Our Work now reaches to Boston northward; to Wilkes-county in Georgia, southward; & to Albany,

Vermont, Lake Champlain, Redstone, and Kentucky, Westward. A length of about ^{13 or} 1400 miles, and a breadth of between 500 & 1000. Our Society in the States amount to upwards of 60,000. These, I am persuaded, may with safety be multiplied by five to give us our regular Sundays Congregations, which will make 300,000. If the ^{one} calculation of some great Writers be just, three fifths of any given Country consist of Un-adults. So that the Families, the Adults of which regularly attend Divine Service among us, amount according to this mode of calculation to 750,000. About a fifth part of these are Blacks. How great then would be the strength of our Church, (will you give me leave to call it so? I mean, the Protestant Episcopal) if the two sticks were made one?

But how can this be done? the magnitude of the Object would justify considerable sacrifices. A solemn engagement to us your Prayer-book in all our places of worship on the Lord's Day would of course be a sine qua non, a conception we should be obliged to make on our parts: (if it may be called a conception); and there would be, I doubt not, other conceptions to be made by us. But what conceptions would it be necessary for You to make? For the opening of this subject with all possible candour, it will be necessary to take a view of the ^{present} state of the Ministry in the Methodist Church in these States.

We have about 250 Travelling Preachers; and a vastly greater number of Local Preachers, I mean, Preachers who live on their Plantations or are occupied in the exercise of Trades or Professions, and confined to a small sphere of action in respect to their ministerial labours. About seventy of our Travelling-Preachers are Elders (as we call them) or Presbyters. These are the most eminent and most approved of the whole Body: & a very excellent set of Clergy I really believe they are. We have about the same number of Deacons among the Travelling-Preachers, who exercise the Office of Deacon according to the Plan of the Church of England. These Ministers, both Presbyters and Deacons, must be elected by a majority of the Conference, before they can be ordained. A Superintendent only ordains the Deacons; and a Superintendent

must make one of the Presbytery for the Ordination of a Priest or Elder: and the Superintendents are invested with a negative voice in respect to the Ordination of any person that has been elected for the Office either of Elder or Deacon. Among the Local Preachers there is no higher Office than that of a Deacon. The Local Preacher does not pass through an Election for this Office: but if he bring a Testimonial signed by three Elders (one of whom must be, what we call, a Presiding-Elder, one who has the Government of a District, i. e. several Circuits joined together) three Deacons, three unordained Preachers, and the majority of the Class of which he is a Member (or the Stewards and Leaders of the whole Society of which he is a Member,) a Superintendent may then, if he please, ordain him: and a great many of the oldest and wisest of the Local Preachers have been ordained Deacons on this Plan.

Now, on a Re-union's taking place, our Ministers, both Elders and Deacons, would expect to have, and ought to have, the same authority they have at present, of administering the Ordinances according to the respective powers already invested in them. For this purpose I well know they must submit to a Re-Ordination, which I believe might be easily brought about, if every other hindrance was removed out of the way. But the grand objection would arise from the want of confidence which the Deacons and unordained Preachers would experience. The present Bishops might give them such assurances as would perhaps remove all their fears concerning them. But they could give no security for their Successors, or for any new Bishops who may be consecrated for the Episcopal Church in those States, which have not at present an Episcopal Minister. The requisition of Learning for the Ministry (I mean the Knowledge of the New Testament in the Original, and of the Latin Tongue) would be an insuperable objection on this ground, as the present Bishops, and the present members of the General Convention, can give no sufficient security for their Successors. And the Preachers could never, I believe, be induced to give up the full confidence they have in

their present Superintendents, that they shall in due time rise to the higher Offices of the Church according to their respective merits, for any change of situation in which the confidence they should then possess would not be equivalent.

But what can be done to gain this Confidence on the plan of a Re-union of the two Churches? I will answer this important question with all simplicity, plainness and boldness: and the more so, because, 1st I am addressing myself, I have no doubt, to a person of perfect candour: 2^{dly} I have a Re-union so much at heart, that I would omit nothing that may, according to the best of my judgment, throw light on the subject: And, 3^{dly} because I think I am not in danger from your charitable spirit, to be suspected in the present instance of pressing after worldly honour: as it is probable I shall be elected President of the European Methodists, and shall not, I believe, receive greater marks of respect from the Methodists in these States, supposing I ever be a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, than they are at present so kind as to shew me.

M^r Asbury, our Resident Superintendent, is a great and good man. He possesses, and justly, the esteem of most of the Preachers & most of the People. Now, if the General Convention of the Clergy, consented that he should be consecrated a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the supposition of a Re-union, a very capital hindrance would be removed out of the way.

Again, I love the Methodists in America, and could not think of leaving them entirely, whatever might happen to me in Europe. The Preachers and People also love me. Many of them have a peculiar regard for me. But I could not with propriety visit the American Methodists, possessing in our Church on this side of the water an Office inferior to that of M^r Asbury.

But if the two Houses of the Convention of the Clergy would consent to ^{the consecration of} M^r Asbury and me as Bishops of the Methodist Society in the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, ^{or by any other title, if that be not proper} on the supposition of the Re-union of the two Churches under proper mutual stipulations; and engage that the Methodist Societies shall have a regular supply on the death of their Bishops

and so ad perpetuum, the grand difficulty in respect to the Preachers would be removed — they would have the same men to confide in, whom they have at present, & all other mutual stipulations would soon be settled.

I said in respect to the Preachers, for I do not fully know Mr. Asbury's mind on the subject. I have my fears in respect to his sentiments: and if he do not accede to the Union, it will not take place so completely as I could wish. I wish You could see my ^{sincerity} heartily but that is impossible.

I think I need not observe that if things were brought to a happy issue, we should still expect to enjoy all our rights as a Society in the most exclusive sense, as we do now in Europe: I mean the receiving or rejecting Members in or from our Classes, Bands, Love-feasts, &c.

I have had the honour of three interviews with Bishop White on this subject, & some correspondence. In the present state of things I must intreat the favour of You to lay this business only before Your confidential Friends. And if You honour me with a Letter by the June Packet, directed to the Rev. D.^r Coke, at the New Chapel, City-Road, London, I will write to You again ^{immediately} after the English Conference, which will commence in Manchester the last Tuesday in next July.

The importance of the subject on which I have now written to You, will, I think, prevent the necessity of an apology for the Liberty I have taken in writing to You.

Permit me to subscribe myself, with great respect,


Right Res.^t Sir,

Your very humble
and obedient servant

Thomas Coke

The Right Reverend Father
in God, Bishop Seabury.

Philadelphia, May 14. 1791.


 With love from
 The Right Reverend Father
 in God
 Bishop Leabury
 Connecticut





Consecration of Dr. Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, Dec. 17, 1559, in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace. In the picture, the Archbishop has just received the Bible from the hands of Bishop Barlow, sometime of Bath and Wells, now elect of Chichester. Behind Bishop Barlow stand the other consecrating bishops: John Scory of Chichester (now elect of Hereford), John Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford, and (further back, wearing a woolen gown) Miles Coverdale, sometime Bishop of Exeter. The attending priests are Nicholas Bullingham, archdeacon of Lincoln, and Edmund Gest, archdeacon of Canterbury. Bishops Barlow and Hodgkins had been consecrated under Henry VIII, and Bishops Scory and Coverdale, under Edward VI.

NEW FACTS CONCERNING BISHOP SEABURY

[Bishop Seabury arrived in New London late in June, 1785, returning after his Consecration in Scotland by way of Nova Scotia, to which see his friend, the Rev. Charles Inglis (1734-1816) was to come in 1787 as its first bishop. The following is transcribed from a photostat of Inglis' original letter, written from London to Seabury, who had been Connecticut's Diocesan for well over a year.]

London, Mortimer Street, N^o 15
September 14, 1786~

My very Worthy & Right Reverend Friend,

I am favoured with yours, dated New London, July 19th & sincerely rejoice to hear of your Health & Welfare. This Letter contained the first satisfactory Account of your Situation that I had received or heard; & as I was exceedingly anxious for your Success, it was the more pleasing. Sorry I am that the temporal Provision for you is not better—more adequate to your Services, Station & Merit. However, I trust you will be able to rub through for the present, & that God, in his good Providence, will by some other Methods, besides those you mention, supply what is wanting. Wealth & external Grandeur are not essentials of the Church of Christ—when it flourished most & was in its greatest Purity, these Circumstances were unknown to it. Yet it is right that it should have a proper Establishment; for those who serve at the Altar, should live by the Altar. No one more sincerely wishes for the Prosperity of the Church of Connecticut than I do; & I have the firmest Trust that if She adheres to that Truth once delivered to the Saints, as She has hitherto, & I hope always will, those Externals which she yet wants, will in due Time be added to her.

You observe that my last Letter shewed some Lowness of Spirits, which probably was the Case; but this was more owing to bodily Indisposition than any other Cause. Last Winter, Peggy was at the Point of Death. Anxiety for her, & Fatigue, threw me into a violent Fever, which brought me very low, & which I did not fully recover from till very lately. This

Summer I rode more than usual, & have taken Bark frequently, which have braced me up; & I thank God, I feel stronger & heartier now than I have been since I left New York. Indeed my State of Health has been wretched since I came to England—totally relaxed, & thereby enfeebled, I could scarcely keep awake while in Company; & at Night could not sleep. These Symptoms were doubtless aggravated by the Disasters & Calamities I had suffered— Time, that kind Assuager of Aff[li]ction, seems to have softened these somewhat; & blessed be God, I have now Reason to hope for more Health in future.

A few Weeks since I received the first Payment of my Compensation, which was greatly inferior to what I had a Right to expect; being only £1468, when my just Claim was upwards of £9,000. But as more than £2,000 of that Sum consisted of Bonds, which at present are not considered; & as some of my Lands had not been sold, which were also thrown out of the Account at this Time; moreover, as I know not on what Principle the Commissioners proceeded, or what is to be further done: It is impossible to know whether I have Reason to complain or not. What I have received is much greater in Proportion, than what has been received by many others; & since this is the Case, & I never am inclined to be querulous, I chuse to say little, & hope the best.

Before this Time, you have probably heard more particularly how the Conventional Episcopate for the Southern States, is circumstanced; at least, I requested D^r Chandler to transmit to you the Information which I was obliged to communicate to him on that Head; & I am persuaded, if he has not done it, that his Indisposition is the Cause.

The first Conventional Letter to the A. Bishops & Bishops, was very decent. It mentioned Nothing of Alterations in the Liturgy, &c but professed a strong Attachment to the Doctrine & Discipline of the Church of England—hinted that an Episcopate could be obtained from Denmark; but spurned the Idea, as the Members of Convention wished to have the Succession from

from hence; & desired to know, whether Persons sent hither for the Purpose, would be Consecrated Bishops. All this was fair & plausible; but various Reports were circulated here that many Alterations were to be made in the Prayer Book; & D^r Smith in his Sermon before the Convention, hinted that Alterations were intended, without specifying what they were to be. All this roused Suspicions in the Bishops, very justly; & accordingly in their Answer, which I have copied, they declare their Readiness to succour, as far as they are able, the American Church; but as reports prevailed that many Alterations of the Liturgy, Articles, &c were intended, they must in Prudence suspend their Judgment how they were to act, till fully acquainted with those Alterations. This is the Sum & Substance of that Letter, which is very short; & less the Bishops could not do, as the Conventional Letter was very decent, & the Prayer of it was supported by M^r Adams, the American Ambassador, by Dick Peters & other Americans, & even Congress had given its Sanction to the Measure.

In the mean Time, the several Parts of the Prayer Book, as they were printed, came over. Many of the Alterations & Omissions were very much disliked by the Bishops; others seemed trifling & injudicious, & very few for the better. His Grace of Canterbury appeared to be very uneasy & much disgusted. He utterly disliked Smith, & was afraid of his being obtruded; he reprobated many of the Alterations, which he thought injurious to the Essentials of Christianity, although many Things were retained to ascertain the Doctrine of the Trinity. I frequently conversed with him on the Subject; pointed out the Tendency of omitting the Nicene & Athanasian Creeds, when the Rage for Socinianism was so prevalent, to say Nothing of expunging an Article from the Apostle's Creed; & I exclaimed loudly against their shameful Degradation of their Bishop, whose Barber might shave him in the Morning, & in the Evening join in turning him out of his Office. I also hinted to his Grace, that if he & the Bishops wished to see the Church in those Parts saved from utter Ruin, they should interpose to check those Innovations; for although they could do nothing authoritatively, yet they could withhold their Concurrence & not become Parties to such Measures. This was go-

ing as far as I could with Propriety or Prudence.

After much Deliberation, the Arch-Bishop drew up a second Letter to the Convention, which went in the June Packet. It was admirably written. The Substance of it was—that the New Prayer Book had been received—that no supposed Necessity could justify many of the Alterations—that the Bishops were willing to do whatever was consistent with their Duty for the American Church; & to shew their Readiness for this Purpose, they would apply for an Act of Parliament to enable them to Consecrate Bishops without requiring Oaths or Engagements inconsistent with the late Revolution—that something however was required on the Part of the Convention to facilitate this Business, & justify the Bishops in proceeding further—that the discarded Article of the Apostles' Creed be restored; that the Ath. & Nicene Creeds be also restored, so far at least as to leave the Use of them discretionary—that the Bishops be placed on a more permanent & respectable Foot—& that the Persons who, after this, come for Consecration, do bring the Testimonials (drawn up here & inclosed in the Letter) signed by the general Convention, as well as by the Conventions of those States respectively where the Persons reside. It is impossible to draw up Testimonials more solemn or strict than those are; & I think that Smith never can prevail on the Conventions to sign them for him. This Letter, as I said before, went in the June Packet; but did not reach America till after the Convention broke up. I think it will probably have one or other of these Effects—either to bring the Convention to a right Way of thinking & acting; or else totally knock up the Scheme which was pushed forward on bad principles, by some at least; & in either Case, I trust it will turn out advantageously for you. After this Letter was sent off, the Arch Bishop received the whole of the Conventional Prayer Book, & found, to his Astonishment, that even the Reading Psalms have been altered & mangled—at this he seemed much disgusted, being what he did not by any means expect. I imagine this will produce a fresh Remonstrance from his Grace to the Convention; & as for the Gentlemen that are elected to come here for Consecration, the Letter already dispatched

will unquestionably stop their Voyage till there is another General Convention—how the Matter will end, I know not. The Act of Parliament above mentioned, was applied for & obtained.

As to the Nova Scotia Episcopate, there is no saying how it will turn out. His Grace of Canterbury & the Bishop of London presented a Memorial to the King this Summer, praying that due Provision might be made for the Church in our remaining Colonies, & a Bishop appointed to reside there; for it seems the Discovery of what we always believed in America, was made here at last, viz. that the King was fully vested with the Right of appointing American Bishops. His Majesty intirely approved of the Measure, & as is usual in such Cases, referred the Business to a Committee of Council to be reported on—& there the Matter rests. Sir Guy Carleton (now Lord Dorchester) spoke his Sentiments fully on the Subject, which were such as we could wish; the Members of Administration seemed to acquiesce, & the Arch Bishop was & is zealous: Yet Nothing further has been done. As Dr Chandler seems to have no Hope that his Disorder can be removed, he has explicitly relinquished all Claim to the Episcopate; Mr Boucher has also declined it; & so far as I can learn, I am the Person that is considered as most likely now to succeed. But I am by no means sanguine, having many Doubts whether the Appointment itself will take place, though the A. Bishop thinks it will.—The Will of God be done—& whatever becomes of me, may His Church flourish!

Agreeably to your Desire, I called upon Mr Stone about the Mitre. As no Mitres are worn by our Bishops in England, the Manufacture of them is consequently little known. Neither Stone, nor any other Person I could hear of, had ever made one. However, I told Stone he must try his Hand. He & I have consulted together at least a Dozen Times; & we also called in a very ingenious Embroiderer to assist us. After consulting a Variety of Books, Cuts, Monuments, &c (for no real Mitre was to be found) we at last fixed on the Size, Materials & Manner of Execution; all of which I hope will meet your Approbation. The Size I fancy is large enough. The Materials are Paste-Board covered with black Sattin; a Cross, in Gold Embroidery, with a Glory round it, in Front; & a Crown of Thorns, in Gold

Embroidery, on the back Part. The two Lobes, if I may so call them, lined with White Silk; & each pointed with a gilt Cross, such as is usual on the Mitres of Bishops. The lower Part bound with a handsome black Lace, & the Inside lined with black thin Silk. The Ribbons with which it ties down, are Purple & each pointed with a Bit of Gold Lace. My Wish was to have it decent & respectable; without any Thing tawdry, or very expensive about it. What the Expence will be, I know [sic] not, & shall order the Bill to be put up with the Mitre, by which you will learn it—it cannot be very great; & therefore if this Mitre does not please or fit you, the next may be made more to Your Mind.

Give my Love to your Children, whose Welfare I rejoice to hear of. Tell Charles I am indulgent to a small Portion of Laziness in Boys; but it is always with this Proviso, that they double their Diligence afterwards, & bring up their lost Time. I hope he will be a good Scholar, & thereby become an Honour to his Father, & respectable Supporter of the Church. My little Folks are well, & desire to present their Love & Duty to you. Jack gets ahead fast, & has overtaken most of the Latin Scholars at his School, though some had begun Latin 2 or 3 Years before him. He now writes to me in Latin; & although the Latinity is not Ciceronian, yet it is tolerably well for a Boy, not 9 Nine Years old, & who began his Grammar only 18 Months since. Our Friend Duché is well—but over Head & Ears in Swedenborg. He is likely to draw in Kempe, who seems inclined to change the Gentoos for the Swedish Knight. No Man has a better Heart than Duche; but I often grieve & am astonished at his constant Propensity to unintelligible, paradoxical Systems. This Letter I intend should go by Young Mr Kane—I hope the Mitre will be ready to go with him also—they must go together. There has not been a Moment lost in setting about the Mitre & having it done since your Letter arrived.—I wish you would write oftener to your Friends on this side of the Water—I should think it would not be amiss to write to some of the Bishops—particularly to his Grace of Canterbury. It could do no Hurt, & might be of Use. The Bishops wish well to your Church, & Information of its State would, I believe, be

well received. That the Almighty may bless you, & prosper your Endeavours for the Furtherance of his Kingdom & Edification of his Church, is the unfeigned Prayer of your ever affectionate Friend

Charles Inglis

R. Rev.^d Bishop Seabury ✓

[We are indebted to the Hon. Reginald V. Harris, Q.C., Chancellor of the Diocese of Nova Scotia, for the following passages concerning Bishop Seabury in his book on Saint Paul's Church, Halifax.]

"Bishop Samuel Seabury, of Connecticut, who had been consecrated in Aberdeen by Bishop Kilgour and others on November 14, 1784, as the first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, arrived in Halifax on the ship Chapman—Dawson, Master—in May 1785, after extremely rough weather. Here he stayed ten days. Rev. Dr. Breynon writes, 'He was treated with great civility by all that I and Col. Hannory could influence. He preached here in my church and performed very well.' This was the first sermon preached by an Anglican bishop in what is now Canada.

"Later he proceeded to Annapolis Royal, where his half-brother David resided, and preached there, meeting many of the Loyalist newcomers. Some days later he crossed to Saint John, where his daughter Abigail, resided, the wife of Colin Campbell, a vestryman of Trinity Church in which he also preached on several Sundays. From Saint John he sailed to Newport, Rhode Island, where he preached his first sermon in the new Republic."

[Chancellor Harris also sends the following concerning Bishop Seabury's half-brother from the History of Annapolis County, Nova Scotia, published by W. A. Calne, with supplement by Judge A. W. Savary:]

DAVID SEABURY—1785-1786

Mr. Seabury was a half brother of Samuel Seabury D.D., the first Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in

the United States, and also one of the fifty-five petitioners, with Abijah Willard, for lands in Nova Scotia. Sabine misnames him Daniel. Tradition affirms that he once owned and occupied the Alexander Howe farm (now Gesner's) in Granville. Having taken an active part in the revolutionary war against the popular cause, he became a Loyalist exile, and with his wife and several children sought a new home in this province in 1783.

His wife, a very exemplary and pious woman, about 1792 became a warm adherent to the Wesleyan movement, which, through the missionary zeal of Black and other clever and devout men, made considerable advances at that period. Two of her daughters are said to have married Methodist ministers.

Seabury was on two several occasions returned as member of the Assembly. In 1785 he first sought the suffrages of the people in opposition to Alexander Howe, who also for the first time became a candidate for a seat in the House. In the contest which ensued much heat and party acrimony were evolved, Mr. Seabury receiving the almost undivided support of the new Loyalist settlers, besides possessing the influence of the Sheriff, Doctor Tucker.

Mr. Seabury was declared duly elected, but on the petition of his opponent, the House vacated the seat and ordered the election to be run over. The same candidates took the field and the battle was fought over.

It was during the excitement of this period that Barclay drew upon himself the censure of the Assembly for words used in a letter published in a newspaper of the day, and which seemed to impeach the wisdom of that body in vacating the seat. Tucker again returned Seabury as having been duly chosen, and Howe again petitioned against the return, claiming the seat, which was finally awarded to him by a resolution of the Assembly. Mr. Seabury's public life seems to have closed with this contest, though he was a leading magistrate in the county for the succeeding twenty years of his residence in it. In 1791 he was appointed a commissioner, with William Winniett and John Rice, for the construction of a bridge over Allain's creek, and for some years after this date he was acting agent of the Government on Indian affairs. He was also lieutenant-colonel of the county militia.

Having been reduced in wealth previous to 1806, through heavy losses sustained in the trade in which he had some time before embarked all his available means, he determined to return to his old home in the State of New York, in which he had lived in the old colonial times. From the time of this event the writer has been unable to recover any particulars concerning him.

Mr. Seabury seems to have been a man of good parts and fair education, and to have possessed considerable energy of character, and that he exerted his abilities to the utmost in the direction of the public weal, there is no reason to doubt.

[Chancellor Harris has sent the following extract from W. O. Raymond's The River St. John, pp. 250-251.:

It was not without forethought and serious consideration that the Loyalists came to settle on the River St. John. Several associations were formed at New York in 1782 to further the plans of those intending to settle in Nova Scotia. One of these associations had as its president the Reverend Dr. Seabury and for its secretary Sampson Salter Blowers. (The former was afterwards the first Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and the latter was Chief Justice of Nova Scotia.) Under the arrangements made by this association a great many Loyalists came to the River St. John in May 1783. "Articles of Settlement" were agreed upon at New York.

The deputation which waited on Sir Guy Carleton, viz., Rev. Dr. Seabury and Lieut. Col. B. Thompson, were assured by the Commander in Chief that he approved of the proposals submitted, and that the terms of settlement would be at least equivalent to them. He desired to give every encouragement to those intending to settle in Nova Scotia and would write to the Governor of the province in their behalf. He advised the association to send agents to examine the vacant lands and see where settlements could best be made.

The following agreement in connection with the matter was widely circulated in New York and on Long Island, Staten Island and the vicinity, and signed by many heads of families:-

"We whose names are hereunto subscribed do agree to remove to the Province of Nova Scotia, on the above encouragement with our families, in full reliance on the future support of Government, and having been approved of as such by His Majesty's Commissioner for restoring Peace; Lieut. Col. B. Thompson, K. A. D., Lieut. Col. E. Winslow, Gen. Muster-Master provincial forces; Major Joshua Upham, Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury, Rev. John Sayre, Captain Maudsley, Amos Botsford, Esq., Samuel Cummings, Esq., Judge John Wardie, James Peters, Esq., Frederick Hauser."

(p. 280) - ARTICLES OF SETTLEMENT IN NOVA SCOTIA
Made with the Loyalists at New York in 1783.

"The Reverend Dr. Samuel Seabury and Lieut. Col. B. Thompson of the Kings American Dragoons, having been appointed by the Board of Agents to wait on His Excellency Sir Guy Carleton, Commander in Chief, in behalf of the Loyalists desirous of emigrating to Nova Scotia, read the following rough proposals, as articles of supply for the settlers in Nova Scotia:

1st. That they be provided with proper vessels, and convoy, to carry them, their horses and cattle, as near as possible to the place appointed for their settlement.

2nd. That besides the provisions for the voyage, one year's provision be allowed them, or money to enable them to purchase.

3rd. That some allowance of warm clothing be made in proportion to the wants of each family.

4th. That an allowance of medicines be granted, such as shall be thought necessary.

5th. That pairs of mill-stones, necessary iron works for grist mill, and saws and other necessary articles for saw-mills be granted them.

6th. That a quantity of nails and spikes, hoes and axes, spades and shovels, plough irons, and such other farming utensils as shall appear necessary, be provided for them, and also a proportion of window glass.

7th. That such a tract or tracts of land, free from disputed titles and as conveniently situated as may be, be granted, surveyed and divided at the public cost so as to afford from 300 to 600 acres of useful land to each family.

8th. That over and above 2,000 acres in every township be allowed for the support of a clergyman, and 1,000 acres for the support of a school, and that these lands be unalienable for ever.

9th. That a sufficient number of good muskets and cannon be allowed, with a proper quantity of powder and ball for their use, to enable them to defend themselves against any hostile invasion; also a proportion of powder and lead for hunting.

The agents were furnished with detailed instructions directing them to ascertain the quality of soil, timber, game, limestone and other natural resources; to examine the rivers, bays, harbors, lakes and streams with regard to mills, fishing and trade; also to ascertain what difficulties and obstructions might be anticipated in forming settlements; also whether the tracts desired were free from disputed titles; also what lands in the neighbourhood were granted and to whom, whether forfeited or whether they might be purchased and at what rate, etc.

In accordance with Sir Guy Carleton's advice, Amos Botsford, Samuel Cummings and Frederick Hauser were sent as agents. They arrived at Annapolis on the 19th October, 1782, along with five hundred Loyalists who had come from New York in nine transport ships. Rev. Jacob Bailey, the S.P.G. missionary, gives a graphic account of their arrival and of the transformation it wrought in the small town:

"On Saturday morning early, we were all surprised with the unexpected appearance of eleven sail of shipping, coming by Goat Island and directing their course towards the town. About nine, two frigates came to anchor, and at ten the remainder, being transports, hauled close in by the King's wharf. On board this fleet were about five hundred refugees who intend to settle in this province. They are a mixture from every province on the continent except Georgia. Yesterday they landed, and our royal city of Annapolis, which three days ago contained only 120 souls, has now about 600 inhabitants. You cannot realize what an amazing alteration this even has occasioned. Everything is alive, and both the townspeople and the soldiers are lost among the strangers. All the houses and barracks are crowded and many are unable to procure any lodgings. Most of these distressed people left large possessions in the rebellious colonies, and their sufferings on account of their loyalty, and their present uncertain and destitute condition render them very affecting objects of compassion. Three agents are dispatched to Halifax to solicit lands from the government."

The agents were bearers of a letter from Sir Guy Carleton to the Governor of Nova Scotia commending the Loyalists to his consideration:

"These persons, (he writes) are to be considered as real efficient settlers, already acquainted with all the necessary arts of culture and habituated to settlements of the like kind; and who, independent of their just claims, will bring a large accession of strength as well as their exertions in support of Government, so they will not only, in my judgment, be well entitled to grants now desired, but to all such advantages of every sort which have been promised by proclamation or otherwise to persons invited to settle in that province."

The agents, on their return from Halifax, where they had a very satisfactory interview with Governor Parr and the Surveyor General, explored the Country in the neighbourhood of Annapolis and crossed the Bay of Fundy to St. John about the end of November.

[Chancellor Harris has also transmitted the following additional details:]

DAVID SEABURY: The Parish Registers of Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, record that he was elected a Vestryman on October 8, 1789. His wife's name was Ann. She was confirmed by Bp. Charles Inglis on Sept. 7, 1791. Their daughter Ann was baptized on Oct. 8, 1784, and a second daughter, Margaret, was baptized on Oct. 11, 1786.

SAMUEL SEABURY: He had two daughters in Saint John, New Brunswick:

1. ——— married Lieut. Charles Nicoll Taylor of DeLancey's Brigade, who removed to Norfolk, Virginia, where he died.
2. Abigail. Married Colin Campbell. (He may have been Ensign in the King's Orange Rangers Dec. 29, 1776, or Lieut. in the 2nd Batt. of DeLancey's Regt., 1776, 1st Batt., 1782). He was grantee in 1783 of Lots 18 and 61 in Parr Town (the original name of Saint John) and of Lots 100 and 101 in Carleton (now West Saint John). He was appointed the first Clerk of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick in 1785, holding the office until 1796.

SAMUEL SEABURY'S friendliness with the Masons is indicated in the Transactions of the American Lodge of Research, III, pp. 222-232.

Dr. Seabury preached on June 24, 1777, before Zion Lodge, at St. Paul's Chapel, New York. Sermon printed by Hugh Garvie.

Again, on June 26, 1779, before Antient Lodges at St. Paul's Chapel, N.Y. Procession headed by a band.

Again, on Dec. 27, 1782, before Grand Lodge of N.Y. and other Lodges of Ancient Freemasons at St. Paul's Chapel. Sermon printed by Robertsons Mills & Hicks, 1783.

Again, on Dec. 28, 1794, before the Union Lodge in St. James' Church, New London, Conn. [Should not the date be Dec. 23?] Printed by Samuel Green in 1795.

Again, on June 24, 1795, he preached in the morning to Somerset Lodge, Norwalk, Connecticut, following its institution.

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE CONSECRATION OF ABRAHAM JARVIS

[From transcripts in the Jarvis
File of the Diocesan Archives:]

Stratford July 6th. 1797.

Right Rev.^d & Dear Sir

We the Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut, are directed to address the Right Rev.^d Bishops White, Provost, & Bass upon the subject of consecrating our worthy Brother Jarvis, Bishop Elect, to the Episcopal Chair.

We verry sensibly feel the want of an ecclesiastical Center of unity—our rising generation is destitute of the Appostolic rite of Confirmation, and Candidates for the Ministry are discouraged from coming forward to supply our vacant churches, by behold-ing the Episcopal chair empty. These & many other reasons unite to render both the Clergy & Laity of the Church in Connecticut verry desirous to have the sacred Hierarchy established among us as soon as may be conveniently done. We have been indirectly informed that Bishops Provost & Bass have no objec-tions of meeting in Connecticut this Autumn, provided it meets with your approbation.

It would be verry agreeable to our Brethren the Clergy to attend the Con-secration, and should it be agree'd on by the Bishops to meet in this State; We beg leave to mention the City of New Haven as the Place, on St Luke's Day the 18th of October next. Pre-vious to our consulting the other Bishops on this subject, we shall wait your answer, which we wish may be as soon as is convenient. Should our re-quest be complied with by our Father in Christ we should consider ourselves under the highest obligations to do every thing in our power to render him happy whilst among us—

May God preserve our Episcopacy precious in his sight, and prosper the pious labors of his Servants

With every sentiment of respect and esteem, we are,

Right Rev.^d Father in God
Your Most Obedient and
dutiful Sons in Christ

Please to Direct ASHBEL BALDWIN
to the Rev.^d WILLIAM SMITH
Ashbel Baldwin PHILO SHELTON
Stratford—

The Right Rev.^d Doc.^{tr} White Bishop
of the Prot. Episcopal Church in
the State of Pennsylvania

P.S.

Right Rev.^d Sir If you cannot make it convenient to gratify us, by con-vening the Bishops in Connecticut, We wish you to inform us the Time and place you shall appoint to con-secrate the Bishop Elect.—

Stratford July 20th. 1797

Right Rev.^d Sir.—

Your obliging favour has been duly received. Agreeable to your direc-tions, I have wrote to M^r Smith the President of the Committee, it is in-closed, which I will thank you to for-ward. Testimonials for the Bishop Elect have likewise been forwarded to Doctor Parker Boston, we expect a re-turn in a few days when they will be sent to New York, & from thence to Philadelphia. The standing Committee meet again this week, to make some arrangements for the Bishops Consecra-tion, you will hear from us soon. In the mean time believe me

Right Rev.^d Sir to be with sentiments
of great respect

Your Most Obedient
Humble Servant
Ashbel Baldwin

Right Revd Doctor White.

Right Rev.^d Sir

We had the pleasure of receiving your favors of date the 17 inst.— in-forming that it was agreeable to you to accede to our wishes expressed to you concerning the consecration of the Bp. Elect for the State of Connecticut —for which be pleased to accept of

our thanks. The necessary Testimonials are already made out and forwarded to Dr. Parker for the purpose of acquiring the signatures of the Committee of the Eastern States. Also, agreeable to your direction, Testimonials have been sent to the President of the Standing Committee to be signed by the Committee in Pennsylvania & N. Jersey. Howsoever soon we receive these Testimonials properly authenticated, we will do ourselves the pleasure of giving you timely information.

We have the honor to be
Right Rev^d Sir

Your most obed.^t &
Very hu.^l servants

William Smith
Philo Shelton
Ashbel Baldwin

Norwalk July 25 1797

Stratford August 8th 1797

Right Rev.^d Sir,

Yours of the 31th Ultimo is now before me, & I beg leave to mention the circumstances that lead to the mistake refer'd to in your Letter. When I wrote to the Honob.^l William Smith, the Committee were not together, & upon looking over the list of the Standing Committee, I did not find Doctor Smith's name as a Member from Pennsylvania; therefore concluded hastily, that it must be the Honorable W^m Smith, who was the President. I gave the Letter under cover to you, to one of my Neighbors who expected to set out in a few Days for Philadelphia. Three days after the Committee were together at Norwalk, who were made acquainted with what I had done; upon examination we discovered the mistake, & immediately wrote another Letter to yourself, & one to Doctor Smith, intending to stop the Stage, take out the Testimonials from the Letter addressed to the Honorb.^l W^m Smith & inclose them in the one directed to Doctor Smith. But when the Stage came on, we found the Gentleman had put up the Letter in the bottom of his Trunk, & that it would take up so much time, that the passengers would not patiently wait: Accordingly all the Letters went on, which has occasioned some delay & given unnecessary trouble. The next morning to prevent any further delay in this business another Letter was

addressed to Doctor Smith enclosing the Testimonials, requesting his assistance in procuring the necessary Signatures: That Letter was put immediately into the Mail, & I presume it must have reach'd Philadelphia before this Time. I have received The Testimonials sent to the Eastward, which have been signed by the standing Committee in New England. They are forwarded to Doctor Moore in New York, with a request that he would have them sign'd by the Committee in that State, give them a speedy conveyance to the Committee in New Jersey & from thence to Bishop White. But in case the last Letter to Doctor Smith should not arrive, I have presumed to enclose the Testimonials again, will you be so obliging as to hand them to Doctor Smith or some one of the Committee. I hope Sir the necessary business for the consecration of our Bishop elect is in a fair train to be compleated agreeable to the Canons of our Church.

Be pleased Sir to excuse this long Letter and believe me with best wishes for your happiness

Your Friend & humble Servant

Ashbel Baldwin

Right Rev^d Doctor White.

To the Right Rev.^d Doctor White Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the State of Pennsylvania

The Committee in the Name and by the Desire of the Convention of this State beg leave to present their most affectionate and grateful acknowledgments for the polite and Christian attention you have manifested toward the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut.— Be assured Rev.^d Father the favour you have done us will ever be gratefull in our remembrance and we pray that the pleasure of the Lord may ever prosper in your hands and that your Apostleship and Episcopacy may be always precious before God and acceptable to Men

Ashbel Baldwin
William Smith
Philo Shelton
John Cannon
Philp. Nichols
Eli Curtiss

Committee

Newhaven Oct 19th 1797

JARVIS PAPERS IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

By PATRICIA HOWARD PARK

[Mrs. Park is Secretary to the Librarian of the General Theological Seminary, Niels H. Sonne, Esq. Her husband is a student of the Seminary, or was at the time this important material was submitted to us for publication. This list of the papers of SAMUEL FARMAR JARVIS (1786-1851), son of Bishop Abraham Jarvis, supplements other lists that have previously been published in THE HISTORIOGRAPHER OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF CONNECTICUT.]

Date	Writer	Recipient	Type or Title	Pp.	Remarks
Dec 28 1818	The Rev. S.H.Turner	S.R.Jarvis	letter	4	
Mar 8 1819	S.H.Turner	S.F. Jarvis	letter	3	
Mar 12 1819	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Apr 3 1819	faculty	Gen.Convention	draft of a communication	1	letter from Turner to J. on back
Sep 21 1819	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	2	
Oct 12, Oct 18 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Bp.Hobart	letters (copies)	1 each	
Oct 18 1819	S.F.Jarvis		draft of advertisement recalling students	1	
Oct 19 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Bishop _____	letter	2	
Nov 1 1819	Bp.White	D.J.Greene	letter	1	copy
Nov 6 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Hon.R.King	letter	3	copy
Nov 15 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Bp.White	letter	1	copy
Nov 15 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Bp.White (?)	start of a letter (?)	1	

Dec 21 1819	S.F.Jarvis	Bishop _____	letter (draft?)	6	incomplete
Jan 29 1820	S.F.Jarvis	C.E.Gadsden	letter	4	copy
Mar 28 1820	S.F.Jarvis	Bp.Hobart	letter	1	copy
Apr 3 1820	Bp.Hobart	G.Sullivan	letter	1	
Apr 8 1820	S.F.Jarvis	committee on Theol.Sem.of P.E.Church	statement	10	2 copies
Apr 8 1820	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	report	5	
May 6 1820	S.F.Jarvis	Bp.White	letter	2	copy
Jun 13 1820	W.Meredith	S.F.Jarvis	letter	1	
July 17 1820	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Aug 29 1820	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Sep 18 1820	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	2	
Apr 23 1821	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Oct 14 1821	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Dec. 4 1821	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Feb 2 1822	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Mar 13 1822	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Jul 26 1822	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	

Sep 30 1822	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Dec 30 1822	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Feb 6 1823	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	2	
Mar 15, May 3 1823	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letters	3 each	
Jul 26 1823	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letters	2	
Sep 16 1823	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Sep 23, Dec 30 1823	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letters	3 each	
Feb 3 1824	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Mar 16 1824	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Apr 29 1824	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	4	
Jun 8 1824	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	3	
Feb 3 1826	S.H.Turner	S.F.Jarvis	letter	2	
Apr 4 1826	Sullivan	Bp.Hobart	note	1	copy
Jun 17 1846	S.F.Jarvis	O.S.Prescott	letter	4	
Nov 5 1846	S.F.Jarvis	O.S.Prescott	letter	2	
Oct 3 1849	F.Fitzgerald	S.F.Jarvis	letter	8	
no date	professors		resolution on salaries	1	

Phila., Dec. 28, 1818: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. Turner reports on proceedings of committee meetings which dealt with a "subject in which we are both very deeply interested." Turner had planned to sign a testimonial, but action was delayed by disagreement among committee members, who include Messrs. Chase, Harrod, Kemper and Boyd. The issue is the consecration of a bishop. In referring to a remark made earlier by Jarvis that the committee's work is not altogether above board, Turner denies the accusation, remarking that the committee would not "act for the church in conclave." He suggests that it may apply to Bishop White for counsel. In the postscript dated Jan. 2, 1819, Turner states that on this date another committee meeting was held, at which difficulties were resolved and "Mr. Chase's testimonial was signed by a majority."

Phila., Mar. 8, 1819: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. Turner hopes that Jarvis will accept a professorship in the "contemplated institution," announcing that four students at Philadelphia will soon be ordained, including Judge Wilson.

Phila., Mar. 12, 1819: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. Turner reaffirms belief in what he communicated to Jarvis in an earlier letter that all students in the proposed theological institution should follow one course of study. He feels that a choice between a longer and a shorter course will result in most students' electing the former. Although he admits that the books with which a candidate for orders must be familiar can be studied in one year, "if the church is to be content with this requisition, where is the use of a Theological School at all?" He then discusses the canonical requirement of one year's preparation for ordination, considering it only as a minimum. Ideally each student should study until he is thoroughly prepared, the time varying with each person. (Bishop White agrees with him on this point.) "It is very plain...that 3 yr. are a period short enough. If our church is to attain an elevated stand, it must be by the real piety and sound learning of her clergy, not by an increasing multitude of uninformed & indolent ministers."

April 3, 1819: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. A note left at Mr.

Jarvis' residence, written on the back of a draft of a communication from the professors "in the Theolog. Seminary of the Prot. Ep. Church in the U.S." to a committee of the General Convention. Turner wishes to see Jarvis on the following day.

Chester Town, Md., Sept. 21, 1819: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. Turner's sister has been ill and is now recovered except for "weakness and the effects of calomel on her mouth." He congratulates Jarvis upon the receipt of his doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania.

Phila., Sept. 25, 1819: Samuel H. Turner to Samuel F. Jarvis. Turner quotes Bishop Wm. White as thinking that the seminary should not be reopened until the meeting of the New York Convention because of the yellow-fever epidemic. It has been proposed to move the Seminary temporarily to Burlington, three students being able to attend classes there: Messrs. Dorr, Mitchell, and Clarke.

N.Y., Oct. 12, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bp. Hobart. Jarvis advises the Bp. that he has resigned his rectorship of St. Michael's, Bloomingdale, and will soon resign from St. James' to accept a professorship at the Theological Seminary. He asks the Bp. to reopen the Seminary as soon as the epidemic is over.

N.Y., Oct. 18, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bp. Hobart. Having been informed by the mayor that the epidemic is over, Jarvis requests the reopening of the Seminary. He reports that collections have been made for the Missionary and Bishop's funds and that Mr. Joshua Jones has custody of them.

N.Y., Oct. 18, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to the students of the Theological Seminary, recalling them and announcing the reopening of the institution. They are to meet at St. Paul's Church on Oct. 25. This announcement is sent to "newspapers in the United States who may be friendly to the interests of Religion."

N.Y., Oct. 19, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bishop Wm. White, Chairman of the Committee on the Theological Seminary. Points out to Bp. White the twofold purpose of the foregoing announcement: to notify students of

the reopening and to publicize the Seminary's existence to the nation so that funds may be raised to ensure its success. He also declares his intention of resigning his professorship the following year and asks that his salary be paid. He has not as yet received any compensation for his teaching.)

Phila., Nov. 1, 1819: Bishop Wm. White to D. J. Greene, Treasurer of the Theological Seminary. Dr. Jarvis should be paid "to an extent which may not interfere with any question likely to be raised as to the quantum."

N.Y., Nov. 6, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to the Hon. Rufus King, a member of the Committee on the Theological Seminary. Jarvis states his salary problem. The Committee has not authorized the treasurer to pay what was agreed upon at the time of his acceptance of the professorship. (A copy of the resolution stating his salary is appended to the document.) Dr. J. has had to borrow money to meet current expenses and asks Mr. King to confer with Bp. White and Mr. Meredith to resolve the difficulty.

N.Y., Nov. 15, 1819: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bp. Wm. White. Jarvis has not yet been paid. This letter is a shorter version of the foregoing letter to Mr. King, requesting justice in the matter of salary.

N.Y., Dec. 21, 1819. Samuel F. Jarvis to Bp. Wm. White [letter incomplete]. Jarvis denies the implication that he was invited to attend a recent Committee meeting, quoting a letter by Bp. Hobart which did not invite but merely made reference to the meeting. Because Jarvis has been attacked by the Committee, he discusses the recent history of the Seminary, the opposition of Bp. Hobart to a seminary under the General Convention, the "compromise" decision of the Convention in 1817 to establish the Seminary in N.Y., the effect of the differences upon fund-raising. Jarvis speaks of the imprudent handling of contributions to the Seminary.

N.Y., Jan. 29, 1820: Samuel F. Jarvis to the Rev. Christopher E. Gadsden, D.D., an old friend. Jarvis deplors the state of the Seminary and discusses his treatment by Bp. Hobart and the Committee. He speaks of the offer of

land by Clement Clark Moore and gives a conversation verbatim between himself and Bp. Hobart concerning the organization of the Seminary. He mentions receiving a letter from the Committee, terminating his services on April 1, 1820, and foresees being blamed for the Seminary's failure at the next meeting of the General Convention. The Seminary has a class of four besides one who is reading Hebrew in Jarvis' home.

N.Y., March 28, 1820: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bp. Hobart, requesting a letter dismissory, he having accepted the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Boston.

[N.Y.?], Apr. 3, 1820: Bishop Hobart to G. Sullivan. The Bp. prefers not to put into writing any comments about the "subject of Mr. Sullivan's work."

April 4, 1820: Mr. G. Sullivan to Bp. Hobart. Wishes the Bishop to state the exact charges made against Dr. Jarvis.

April 8, 1820: Samuel F. Jarvis to the Committee on the Theological Seminary of the P. E. Church. A detailed statement in which Jarvis defends his motives for accepting the professorship, which Bp. Hobart and the Committee have construed as selfish. (Jarvis has been charged with accepting the post only as a means of livelihood while a church was being built in Boston for him.) In a fine defense, Jarvis gives details about the Boston arrangements, where he intends to continue to instruct aspirants to the ministry. Jarvis quotes entreaties from Bp. Griswold and the Rev. Mr. Eaton that he become associate rector with Dr. Gardiner of Trinity Church, Boston. Jarvis manifests his concern for the whole church in America and indicates how it has influenced his decision.

N.Y., April 8, 1820: Samuel H. Turner and Samuel F. Jarvis to Bishop [? White]. They outline the course at the Seminary, naming books and their authors.

N.Y., May 6, 1820: Samuel F. Jarvis to Bishop White. Writes to prepare the bishop for the Committee's unfavorable report, hoping that it will withdraw its charges against him. Regrets having had to attack Bp. Hobart in his defense of his motives.

Phila., June 13, 1820. W. Meredith to Samuel F. Jarvis. Suggests that Jarvis present his case to the recently appointed Trustees of the Seminary, who have taken over the functions of the now dissolved Committee. Expresses sympathy with Jarvis' sufferings and indicates that he, too, has had his "full share of mortification and disappointment." Mention is made of a "proposed book" which Meredith will send to Jarvis by some safe hand.

[Here begins a series of letters from Prof. Turner, at the Seminary in N.Y., to Jarvis, at St. Paul's Church, Boston. Some letters are dated New Haven, during the Seminary's location there.]

N.Y., July 17, 1820. S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis, sending much good news: A constitution and regulations have finally been composed for the Seminary; Bishop Brownell will assist Turner in instructing the seminarians; the Trustees differ with Bp. Hobart as to the area to be covered in appeals for contributions and plan to solicit funds "everywhere within the limits of our church." Turner asks Jarvis for papers and notes to assist in establishing the curriculum.

Phila., S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Asks Jarvis to disregard a recent pamphlet attacking the Seminary and the proceedings of a recent Trustees' meeting. "Pamphleteers very often do good to the cause against which they direct their efforts." Turner feels that men who wish to study theology without taking orders should be allowed to study at the Seminary.

New Haven, Sept. 18, 1820: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Good news! Pintard has donated to the Seminary 165 volumes of books worth 400 or 500 dollars, which, with other sizable gifts, will form the beginning of a library. Desires suggestions for a good Hebrew grammar and urges Jarvis to complete one he is writing. The Seminary has just admitted a "Mr. Croes, son of the bp."

New Haven, Apr. 23, 1821. S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. A German student named Schroeder, is a "wonderful young man" with "an ardent thirst for knowledge...a very inquisitive mind, and a surprising originality of

thought." In instructing him, Turner is guarding him against the perils of Unitarianism, which is rising in Germany. Another student (Eastburn) is "clear headed and discriminating—serious and judiciary." A bequest of \$85,000 may come to the Seminary if the General Convention will move it to the diocese of N.Y. Professor Norton "ascribes the origin of the doctrine of the Trinity to modern Platonism. "Would it not be a curious thing, if the Presbyterians should come round & admit these famous epistles [of Ignatius] as genuine in order to repel this charge? This might pave the way to Episcopacy."

New Haven, Oct. 14, 1821: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Outlines his plans for teaching Hebrew. He will begin with Willard's grammar and give two lessons a week. About 366 volumes have recently been purchased from the collection of the Historical Society in N.Y. by an anonymous gentleman who has donated them, through Mr. Eastburn, to the Seminary library. These include Harduin's Concilia and Montfaucon's Palaeographia.

New Haven, Dec. 4, 1821: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Hopes to meet Jarvis at the forthcoming meeting of the board of Trustees. Regrets a decision of the board to combine the professorships of Biblical Learning and Ecclesiastical History because they are really separate branches of theology and the "Biblical subjects are very extensive in themselves, & becoming daily more & more important from circumstances."

Phila., Feb. 2, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. He has sent Jarvis an account of the consecration of Trinity Church written by Mr. Abercrombie. The Seminary in N.Y. will soon reopen, though, unfortunately, the newspapers carry no notice of the fact. He gives details of his course.

N.Y., March 13, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. The Seminary has reopened in N.Y. and Turner, in his home on Franklin Street, has a room "for a prophet" whenever Jarvis is in N.Y. There is excitement in the Seminary. Rooms for instruction are being readied. The library is temporarily at St. John's. Students number 22. The professors include Bp. Hobart, Dr. Wilson, Mr. Onderdonk, Mr.

Moore, Mr. Verplanck, and Dr. Turner. Bp. Hobart delivered a laudable inaugural address at Trinity Church, stating that the objects of the Seminary were "the preparing of a learned, orthodox, pious & practical ministry."

N.Y., July 26, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Describes a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees. A student, "the elder Johnson," has delivered an excellent essay which Jarvis ought to consider for publication in the Gospel Advocate. Turner concludes with some of his thoughts on Regeneration.

N.Y., July 26, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis, discusses the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary.

N.Y., Sept. 30, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. The student named Johnson, referred to in a previous letter, is soon to be ordained and will go to Richmond, Va., at a salary of \$1,000. In reply to Jarvis' request for a young man for a post in Cambridge, Turner recommends Schroeder or Eastburn—especially the latter, who is the more conservative.

N.Y., Dec. 30, 1822: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. The Seminary professors have decided to alternate in delivering annual discourses in order to assist in "bringing the Institution before the publick." Though interest in the Seminary has lagged, Turner is optimistic, feeling that "if we can carry into operation a pretty good course of studies, a few years will illustrate its utility and promote its influence." Mention is made of Bp. B[rownell]'s intention to establish a college at Hartford; another is to be organized in Geneva, N.Y. Turner fears that they may harm the cause of learning rather than further it. The Seminary does not relish having competitors.

N.Y., Feb. 6, 1823: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Bp. Hobart has decided to abandon the Branch School and to assist the establishment of the college at Geneva. Closing the Branch School will greatly aid donations to the Seminary.

N.Y., Mar. 15, 1823. S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Jarvis' friend Wilby

has criticized Turner's style of preaching perhaps because of acquired oratorical faults imitative of other preachers. "It is the fault of imitation... to pursue blemishes rather than excellencies." A church in Phila. is soon to be consecrated. It cost \$35,000, has 170 pews, 80 of which have been sold for \$21,000.

N.Y., May 3, 1823: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Replying to Jarvis' request for young men to serve in Salem and Cambridge, Mass., Turner suggests that such posts be filled by older and more experienced clergymen. "The Bible Society controversy is revived."

N.Y., July 26, 1823: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Commencement exercises took place yesterday, Bp. White delivering the address. The Trustees hope to reduce student expenses.

N.Y., Sept. 16, 1823: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Mr. Schroeder has been elected to serve the united churches of Trinity Parish for one year. Bp. Hobart is traveling to England for his health. Asks Jarvis to procure several books which Harvard Library has put up for sale.

N.Y., Dec. 30, 1823: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Recommends for the still-vacant post in Cambridge a Mr. R. Johnson, who is soon to be ordained and who does not wish "to lounge about the city, as too many young men have done immediately after receiving orders." Subscriptions to the Seminary are again slow. The annual expenses have exceeded the income by nearly \$1,000.

N.Y., Feb. 3, 1824: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Disapproves of Bp. Hobart's reply to Bp. Brownell's circular. Disapproves the circular itself. An unvaccinated student, Sanford Billings, has died of smallpox. With trepidation Turner has just published a work on Romans.

N.Y., Mar. 16, 1824. S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Sends a collection of hymns borrowed from Dr. Gadsden for Dr. Jarvis' persual. Mr. Moore and Turner are formulating a plan for a Seminary building. Classes are small. "Young men will not remain in the Institution 3 yrs. if they can get into holy orders after...18 months."

N.Y., April 29, 1824: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. Reports on a recent sale at Eastburn's. A number of volumes and their prices are given, including Strype's Memorials, Wolf's Bibliotheca, Schulten's On Job. Turner purchased Eusebius' Chronicon for the Seminary library for \$4.25.

N.Y., June 8, 1824. S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. The Society for the Advancement of Religion and Learning has appropriated funds for the Seminary library. Two students having arrived to enter the class which will graduate in six weeks, Turner comments: "There seems to be a very extraordinary inattention to certain plain, simple & necessary points, by some of the well wishers of the Seminary."

N.Y., Feb. 3, 1826: S. H. Turner to S. F. Jarvis. As members of the Seminary Psalm and Hymn Committee, Turner indicates that he and Jarvis are dividing the Psalms between them and with compare them with Tate & Brady, which they may revise. Only six new students have entered this year because, doubtless, of the lack of interest of clergymen throughout the country. The foundation of a new building has been dug.

Middletown, Conn., June 17, 1846: Samuel F. Jarvis to O. S. Prescott. Answering a request for advice in studying ecclesiastical history, Jarvis recommends the study of primary sources, for "modern works...are not original witnesses" and may misrepresent history through bias or inaccuracy. He recommends, among the ancient historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. Prescott is advised to compare their views.

Middletown, Conn., Nov. 5, 1846: Samuel F. Jarvis to O. S. Prescott. Jarvis warns Prescott (who wishes to leave the Seminary and study with Jarvis) that he must secure the Bishop's permission. He says his methods are different from those at the Seminary: "I teach by subjects rather than textbooks...a slower but a surer process."

Cool Spring, N.C., Oct. 3, 1849: F. Fitzgerald to Samuel F. Jarvis. Recently returned from India, Fitzgerald gives his impressions of that country—especially of a shrine in Bengal of the "foul Goddess Cali, to whom Pilgrims daily offer hundreds of slain victims

of Bullocks and goats." A book by Dr. Mill (Christa Sangita), written in "the sacred language of the Brahmins and Pundits," has helped to make them aware of Christianity. These sects believe "the language exalts the subject...of which it speaks." Two strong impressions were formed on this trip: an unprecedented state of idolatry exists in India; the only saving grace of the oppressed Indians is the authority of the East India Company over them.

S.P.G.

MISSIONARIES IN

NEW ENGLAND, 1740-1780

[From an ancient manuscript
in the Archives of the Diocese.]

Mr. Browne	-	Portsmouth
Mr. Plant	-	Newberry
Macgilchrist	-	Salem
Cutler	-	Christ Church, Boston
Miller	-	Braintree
Thomson	-	Scituate
Price	-	Hopkinton
Checkley	-	Providence
MacSparran	-	Narraganset
Usher	-	Bristol
Beach	-	Newport
Leaming	-	Newport
Graves	-	New London
Johnson	-	Stratford
Lamson	-	Fairfield
Dibblee	-	Stanford
Mansfield	-	Derby
Gibbs	-	Simsbury
Punderson	-	Itinerant
Hutchinson	-	Schoolmaster - Groton
Fayerweather	-	Narraganset
William Clark	-	Stoughton
Winslow	-	Braintree
Serjeant	-	Cambridge
Weeks	-	Marblehead
Bass	-	Newbury
Wiswall	-	Falmouth
Bailey	-	Pownalboro
Mather Byles	-	Portsmouth
Renna Cossit	-	Haverhill

[This list may be supplemented by the following, extracted from "A List of Persons Licensed to the Plantations by the Bishops of London from the year 1745

inclusive" (From the Fulham MSS.) in Collections of the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society, for the Year 1851, N.Y., 1851, pp. 107ff.]

AMERICA IN GENERAL

John Jones	June 19, 1750
Gideon Castlegrave	Jan. 11, 1750
Thomas Browne	July 28, 1764
David Fullerton	June 20, 1767
John Sayre	Sept. 29, 1768
Thomas Fielde	Aug. 2, 1770
Daniel Batwell	Oct. 16, 1773
Myles Cooper	Jan. 4, 1774

CONNECTICUT

Matthew Graves	Oct. 22, 1747
Richard Clark	Feb. 25, 1767
John Tyler	June 29, 1768
John Rutgers Marshall	July 28, 1771
James Nicholls	Feb. 3, 1774

MASSACHUSETTS

Willard Wheeler	Dec. 21, 1767
Mather Byles	June 29, 1768
William Clark	Dec. 22, 1768
Gideon Bostwick	March 14, 1770
Daniel Fogg	Aug. 19, 1770

NEW ENGLAND

Barzillai Dean	Nov. 21, 1745
William McGilchrist	Oct. 10, 1746
William Hooper	June 10, 1747
Jeremiah Leaming	June 21, 1748
Richard Mansfield	Aug. 11, 1748
Jonathan Coulton	March 26, 1752
Ichabod Camp	March 26, 1752
John Fowle	May 24, 1752
Edward Bags	May 24, 1752
Peter Bowers	March 18, 1753
John Troutbeck	May 7, 1754
Solomon Palmer	Oct. 20, 1754
Marmaduke Browne	Jan. 29, 1755
William McClenachan	March 31, 1755
Edward Winslow	March 31, 1755
John Graves	June 4, 1755
Christopher Newton	July 28, 1755
Samuel Fairweather	March 25, 1756
James Scovil	April 4, 1759
Samuel Peters	Aug. 25, 1759
James Greateon	Jan. 28, 1760
Jacob Bailey	March 17, 1761
Thomas Davies	Oct. 26, 1761
Samuel Andrews	Oct. 26, 1761
John Beardsley	Oct. 26, 1763 [1761]
Joshua Wingate Weeks	Apr. 17, 1763
Roger Viets	Apr. 17, 1764
William Walter	Feb. 28, 1764

Abraham Jarvis	Feb. 28, 1764
Bela Hubbard	Feb. 28, 1764
John Lyon	June 29, 1765
John Wiswell	Feb. 11, 1767
Richard Clark	Feb. 27, 1770
Luke Babcock	Feb. 2, 1770
Samuel Parker	Feb. 28, 1774

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Moses Badger	Feb. 23, 1767
Kanna Cossit	March 27, 1773
William Aldington	June 11, 1775

NEW PROVIDENCE

Robert Carter	Sept. 23, 1749
---------------	----------------

BISHOP WILLIAMS' IRENICON TO NORWALK (1890)

[From the Standing Committee
Papers of the Diocese.]

Middletown
Jan. 27th 1890

To the Wardens and Vestrymen
of St. Paul's, Norwalk;

My dear Brothers,

My illness, from the prevalent influenza, has interfered with an earlier reply to the questions which you have laid before me. The delay, however, has had this advantage, that I have been able to give more thought and to take some counsel in regard to the unhappy difficulties at present existing in the Parish.

First of all let me say, that the case is not one which can come under the provisions of Title II. Can. 4. ¶ ii, of the Digest. There is, therefore, no possibility of action by the Bishop under that Canon. Nor is there any other Canon that covers the case, so as to enable the Ecclesiastical Authority to act definitively and finally.

All that the Ecclesiastical Authority can do at present is to advise what it is hoped may lead to an amicable settlement of the unfortunate troubles. And I do especially urge, my dear Brethren that they may be approached in a Christian Spirit of mutual forbearance,

brotherly kindness, and desire for the well being and well doing of the Parish. If any good and permanent result is to be gained it must be gained by treating all questions in a spirit of accommodation and regard for all parties concerned, and not in one which sets all these considerations to one side. There ought to be in your discussions, no place for "clamor" or "wrath" or "bitterness," but only for that "kindness" and "tender heartedness," which God's Word enjoins.

First of all then I would advise a frank and full conference between those who have addressed to the Vestry the petition of which a copy has been sent to me, and to which the Vestry have replied. If any decision can then be reached, it can be submitted—I see no way of avoiding this—to a Parish Meeting. If no decision can be reached still, a Parish Meeting must be called, and the question be submitted to them.

I must repeat it that at this present stage the matter can come before me only for advice and not for adjudication.

I hope and trust that such a conference as I have indicated may prevent the necessity for such adjudication.

Praying God that he may give to your counsels guidance, and blessing, so that "forbearing one another in love," you may keep "the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,"

I am affect. & truly
your friend and bishop

J. Williams.

CONNECTICUT MEMORIES

A PAPER READ AT THE THIRTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE RECTORSHIP
OF THE REV. DR. STEWART MEANS,
ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, NEW HAVEN,
APRIL, 1913

By EDWIN STEVENS LINES

It has long been in my mind that I would some day write down my recollections of some of the Clergy of the Diocese of Connecticut who were in

service about the time of the beginning of my ministry. Such an occasion as this notable Anniversary has seemed to be a suitable one for carrying out my purpose. It has been said that the world is rather weary of the volumes of reminiscences which have been published in recent years. It seems a natural desire to write out what one remembers about people who have gone before one goes himself. There are famous diaries and volumes of reminiscences which have been of the greatest service in the writing of the world's history, such as those of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn, without which knowledge of English history in the seventeenth century would be most indistinct. The greatest of biographies—that of Dr. Johnson—owes its existence to the preservation of a rather minute record of his life by a not altogether admirable man. Boswell made secure his own fame by keeping the record of what Dr. Johnson did and said.

New England owes much to the records which the Mathers and others preserved, and those of us who have lived in New Haven are glad that Professor Dexter edited the diary of President Stiles.

As one looks over the old theological libraries, or sees the neglected volumes of theology in the second-hand book stores, which represent the lifelong labours of the clergy of former days, he wishes that instead of elaborate discourses and treatises they had written down the details of everyday life: how they lived and what it cost; where they went, and their impressions of the people of their own day. An old account book giving prices and business methods is of more value than many elaborate volumes on theology. The lives of people of every kind and condition interest us, while we do not care overmuch about the speculations of the majority of people, especially when, in theology, they did not lead anywhere. The older clergy were very much more interesting than their controversial writings.

Probably there are diaries and personal records waiting to be published which will have great interest for those who shall come after us, although historical societies have done a great deal in looking up and publishing such records. The Rev. Dr. Croswell, Rector of Trinity Church,

New Haven, from 1814 to 1859, during a large part of his ministry kept a diary in which he wrote down day by day his comments upon his parishioners and his impressions gained from parish calls as a most diligent pastor. These volumes are safely put away in the [Yale] college library, and it is said that some generations should pass before they are published, as people would be highly displeased to learn what Dr. Crosswell thought of their ancestors here in New Haven. It is said to be a revelation to learn how a saintly minister (as all regarded him) could make such entries as appear in the diaries. He probably relieved his mind by writing them down, while most of us have similar thoughts which we keep to ourselves in the interest of peace, if from no higher motive. Dr. Crosswell's long pastorate was probably due to the fact that he eased his mind in writing his diary rather than in speech. It is found that it makes for short pastorates when the clergy are free in expressing their opinions of their parishioners.

I suppose that many of us have wished that Bishop Williams had written down or dictated his remembrances of the old Church life of New England, which he knew so well, and his remembrance of men with whom he was associated in the middle of the last century. Here in New Haven, many of us have wished that the knowledge which Governor English and Mr. Horace Day had of New Haven, from traditions or from personal observation, might have been preserved. There is real value in local traditions in the maintenance of pride in the history of communities. The national life is kept vigorous by the preservation of vigorous life in the states, and cities, and towns. It need not narrow one's interest in life to have strong interest in which is of his own state, or of his own community.

This is a rather formidable introduction to a very simple and unpretentious paper. It makes life richer, however, to keep distinctly in mind the old friends who have gone, and it makes for the richer life of the Church to preserve the names and services of men who lived and worked in a former generation. The tendency among us is strong to forget those who have given us our inheritance, and to push on unmindful of those whom we have succeeded. If I

may call to your remembrance some of the older clergy of our part of the Diocese, with reverent appreciation of what they were and what they did, my purpose will be accomplished.

The clergy in charge of our parishes in this part of the Diocese in the generation beginning with the second half of the last century made an interesting company of men. They preserved the traditions of the Church in Connecticut in a very definite way. They were, on the whole, better pastors than preachers, and they were reverent and thoughtful men. There has been a disposition to regard the old Connecticut type of churchmanship as narrow and unprogressive. Very likely Connecticut men have thought the state and Diocese larger than they really were, but this Church and the religious life of the country owe much to Connecticut. The debt to the Episcopal Church in Connecticut for bringing in a sane and gentle form of Christian teaching and living, at a time when New England religion had become hard and controversial, has never been fully recognized. The early strength of our Church in Connecticut was due to the craving of our people for a form of religion which was more scriptural and more gentle than that which had existed here. The presence of the Episcopal Church in considerable strength in Connecticut made unnecessary the Unitarian Movement in Massachusetts, which was a revolt against a theology which could not commend itself to the reason and the heart of a new generation.

I have the impression that this Church never prospered in this country more than in Connecticut in the half century before the War of Independence, when men had to go three thousand miles for ordination. There was not a bishop, and [there were] no confirmations on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. In Connecticut, the Church was presented by men who knew the people, because trained among them and not by royal chaplains. It is a story of a far-away time and not many people seem to care for it now. But it is a fine part of the religious history of the country. Of course, everything was lost in the War of Independence, and only just now have men been large-minded enough to appreciate the work of those who were Loyalists and who

felt obliged to withdraw from New England when their cause was lost. The river ran underground for a long time but finally, towards the middle of the last century, began to appear again. Bishop Seabury had some faithful and devoted men about him in gathering up the fragments that were left and in restoring a good foundation. It was a day of great feebleness. The way in which here and there the desire to bring back the old Church appeared in the first half of the last century is very interesting.

The men who were coming into the care of our parishes about the time that Bishop Williams came to the care of the Diocese retained a good deal of the old spirit. They were men of rather decided convictions, and their sermons generally ended with a rap at the Pope and the Puritans alike. They were rather fearful of enthusiasm in religion at a time when the country was being burned over by revivals. Everything worked together to make the safe man, conservative in speech and in action, the ideal man. It is very easy to write slightly of quiet, dignified, unemotional men who guided the fortunes of the Church fifty or sixty years ago, but that is not the last word to be said about them. It is good to have known some of those men, and [it is] one of the compensations of age that one is allowed to remember them. They have passed beyond the reach of our praise or criticism, but we are poorer if we forget them.

I do not remember back of Bishop Williams' time, for the visits for confirmation came almost wholly to him after his consecration. He had many of the elements of leadership and a generous outlook on life. He was a forceful and interesting preacher, whose personality and presence added much to his power. He had a message for men, and the spirit of New England was strong upon him. He must keep his place as "our bishop" to a considerable number of us who were trained under him. I think he desired no record of his life and work to be made by destroying the materials which a biographer would have used. He impressed himself strongly upon the Diocese, which he traversed for confirmations for many years, and upon hundreds of the younger clergy who came under his personal instruction and who were brought into a

peculiarly close relation to him at the [Berkeley] Divinity School. In the simpler days of living of his time, it is hard to see how he could have gone up and down through the Diocese with all the exposure and the discomforts which accompanied his journeys. He had the gift of establishing a friendly relation with all kinds and conditions of people and was approachable and sympathetic in a way not always associated with his office. I suppose there are some distractions of the present time from which he was free when nearly all the parishes had in them interested and intelligent men guiding the fortunes of the Church. Those of us who knew him well thought of him after all as a lonely man without very intimate friendships; I can understand it better than I once did.

I never saw Dr. Croswell, Rector of Trinity Church from 1814 to 1859, but I have supposed the strength of the Episcopal Church at New Haven (where, with the great Congregational College [Yale], the conditions would not have been thought favorable) was due to his unwearied pastoral work. He had had the interesting experience as an editor at Hudson, N.Y., and he was involved in a very famous trial in which, I think, the principle which holds in suits for libel was changed and settled for this country. He was editor of a paper called The Wasp and was brought to trial in the fierce political controversy in the early part of the last century. This came out in a curious story that was told of Dr. Croswell long after he was the Rector of Trinity Church: "A stranger came to attend Trinity Church on a Sunday morning. He went about to Dr. Croswell's house later in the day, asking if he might see him, and, upon admittance, asked the privilege of putting to him a peculiar question. It was whether he had ever been a printer. Dr. Croswell said, 'Yes,' and [admitted] that he had been in [the] office of The Wasp which had stung Thomas Jefferson and asked the reason for the question. The stranger said that he had observed that Dr. Croswell's gestures in the pulpit had been those of a person setting type, and that he had been curious to learn whether Dr. Croswell had ever had such experience."

I would name among the older group

of clergymen whom I remember as active in the work of the Diocese: the Rev. Dr. Clark of Waterbury, the Rev. Dr. Mead of Norwalk, the Rev. Dr. Hallam of New London. I think they, with President Jackson [or Trinity College], or perhaps Dr. Goodwin of Middletown (whom I do not remember very distinctly) made what were called "The Big Four" and really determined the affairs of the Diocese in the early years of Bishop Williams' administration. Hartford had its own group of strong men in Dr. Washburne, Dr. Coxe, Dr. Burgess, and Dr. Doane, of whom I do not speak particularly because I have limited myself rather closely to the Southern part of the Diocese.

Dr. Mead of Norwalk was a vigorous and aggressive kind of Churchman, strong upon canons and very influential in the General Convention upon legislation. The historic parish of St. Paul's, Norwalk, was his, and he was an outstanding man in Fairfield County. He was not accustomed to being defeated in his plans, and I think the thought concerning him would be that of a forceful, militant, clergyman. A man would hesitate to oppose Dr. Mead in anything unless he was quite sure of himself.

Dr. Jacob L. Clark was a typical New England rector of one of our churches. Not a great preacher, he was an unwearied parish visitor, and his idea of Heaven seemed to be a Sunday School festival. A tall, angular man, he would not have seemed likely to attract children, but he did know how to get hold of them and train them and make of them a great parish. There was a remarkable group of business men in Waterbury in his time, who laid the foundations of the prosperity of Waterbury, and Dr. Clark had their support. The story of his life is the story of the building up of a great parish in a substantial way by faithful and devoted service.

The New Haven Convocation always met in Waterbury in the autumn, and on the afternoon of the second day, in the largest public hall, the Sunday School festival was held with great enthusiasm, addresses being made by some of the visiting clergy. The Rev. Mr. Shannon of Seymour, later of East Haven, on one occasion was saying to this great company that he had been at the Festival and had spoken for some twelve or fifteen years, when the voice of Dr. Clark was heard above his own, saying: "...

and made the same address every time!" Dr. Clark was present when the new school building at Cheshire was dedicated—I think in the year 1867. By this time, a rector of St. Peter's, Cheshire, had come—with an inclination towards more ritual, with which Dr. Clark had not great sympathy. Dr. Clark perceived the drift in the service of dedication, learning that it was the purpose to sing the Creed. So as the time for the Creed came, he effectively (in seeming innocence) started saying it, and as he recited the first words in a rather high tone ("I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY....") the people about him counting Dr. Clark a safe man to follow, joined with him, and the Creed was said, not sung.

In the St. John's Church of Dr. Clark's early ministry, as in many churches of the day, the minister's room for vesting was under the chancel. The arrangement was what was called a "three decker;" the desk for reading the service being back and above the Lord's Table, and the pulpit above that. The last chancel arranged in this way that I remember was in Christ Church, Hartford. Dr. Clark would wear his surplice for the Morning Prayer, then the black gown for the sermon, and then, if the Holy Communion followed, would put on the surplice again. These changes were always of interest to the boys. It is said that Dr. Clark (to save the trouble of going down into the basement for the changes) would get into or out of vestments by crouching down in the rear of the chancel and that the operation could be seen from the ends of the galleries, which were desirable places of outlook for boys at times of Divine Service. Hardly anyone of the old group of clergy holds a more distinct place in my mind than Dr. Clark, partly because my home was near Waterbury and I used to hear much about him and to see him occasionally on the street with his cane on his ceaseless round of parish visiting. Some of the clergy associated with him as assistants became well known in the Church: The Rev. John Eaton Smith, afterwards at Westport; I think the Rev. A. Floridus Steele, of Washington; the Rev. A. Norton Lewis; and especially the Rev. Junius L. Willey, a man very much liked, whose later ministry was in Bridgeport. The Rev. Dr. Clark was deservedly counted a wise man, and his judgment was sought after by neighboring clergy-

man. He was the ideal rector in the minds of the old group of laymen. When my home parish of Naugatuck fell vacant, the officers of the Church asked Dr. Clark to commend a clergyman like himself; so the Rev. James L. Scott was called from Marbledale to Naugatuck, a fine, old-fashioned man. He preached about three quarters of an hour, which seemed over-long to some of my fellow townsmen; so with great courtesy, after long deliberation, they told Mr. Scott that they would be quite satisfied if he would cut his sermons in half. He expressed his willingness to do this, but told them that at Marbledale, where he had been, they would not have thought they got their money's worth if the sermons were shortened.

Of the Rev. James L. Scott, rector of my own parish at Naugatuck in the years just before my ordination, the closing years of whose life were spent at Wallingford, I would wish to write with the greatest respect. I remember my surprise at finding him, at an anniversary at Cheshire, smoking a cigar with the greatest apparent enjoyment, for I had not associated smoking with him. He had made it a strict rule never to smoke in his own parish. When on the Naugatuck R. R. going South, as the train crossed a brook which separated Naugatuck from Oxford, he felt at liberty to go into the smoking car.

In the Diocesan Convention of 1871, at St. Thomas' Church, New Haven, which I remember very distinctly as a student at college, there was rebellion against giving two important offices of the Diocese to one person. The Rev. Dr. Maxcy introduced a resolution, declaring it not expedient to send as deputies to the General Convention more than two members of the Standing Committee of the Diocese. It was preceded by several Whereases, the main thought of which was that it was not wise that the Diocese should be without a quorum of the Standing Committee during the meetings of the General Convention, which might be in distant places. Good Mr. Purves moved to lay the whole matter on the table—which resolution was defeated. The second day the Rev. C. J. Ackley introduced a subsequent resolution, declaring it inexpedient that any man should hold more than one office in the gift of the Convention at the same time—which resolution was also lost. On the motion of the Rev. Dr. Clark the preamble was

stricken out and the motion was adopted. In the election which followed, the Rev. Doctors Mead, Jackson, Beardsley, and the Rev. F. W. Brathwaite were elected delegates to the General Convention, Dr. Clark failing of an election there as also upon the Standing Committee, which included the Rev. Doctors Mead, Hallam, Beardsley, Pynchon and Deshon. I can remember the way in which he took his hat and cane that day and started for Waterbury. (He was, however, elected to the General Convention at the next session—in 1874!)

Dr. Thomas W. Coit and Dr. Gurdon L. Coit keep their places in my mind very distinctly because the first was an instructor in church history at Berkeley [Divinity School] in my time, a rather severe critic of our Puritan ancestors; while, by the latter, I was presented for confirmation at Naugatuck, to which place he came after a long rectorship at Bridgeport near the end of his life. Dr. Thomas W. Coit was the more learned man, but his brother was a very good preacher.

Of Dr. Jackson, President of Trinity College and one of the most prominent men in the Diocese, my remembrance is hardly more than what was associated with his public life and his appearance at the Convention. Because of the relations of his later life to New Haven, Dr. Pynchon was known to many of us. My reminiscences concerning him have come to me through others....

Dr. Lorenzo T. Bennett, I think, was the first secretary of the New Haven Convocation when it was formed in St. Paul's Chapel, New Haven, about seventy-five years ago. He had sailed with Admiral Gregory up the Mediterranean in early life with the thought of entering the U. S. Navy. The comment of the Admiral—which used to be current—"We must make a parson of him!" was very creditable to him but indicated that he had greater fitness for the ministry than for the Navy. From about 1835 to 1840, Dr. Bennett was associated with Dr. Croswell in the care of Trinity and St. Paul's, New Haven. Then he went to Guilford for his forty years' rectorship there. It used to be said that Dr. Bennett never went away from home without carrying a sermon with him for use in an emergency—so frequently were the clergy in the old time asked to help out

their brethren. His quiet, dignified manner will be remembered distinctly by all those who knew him. He came out of a time when men grew old in a more stately way than they do today.

None of us who lived in New Haven in those days can fail to recall the Rev. Dr. Vibbert. Engaged in business in early life, he gave himself to the ministry and was for forty years rector of St. James' Church, Fairhaven, it being his only parish and he being until his death the only rector the parish had had. Dr. Vibbert always came to meetings of the Convocation, and to United Services, always showing his interest in his brethren by keeping knowledge of the younger men with wider interest than a good many of the clergy today. He was a good French scholar and a well-read man. He was an excellent reader of the service. I think he followed the custom of reading over the services by himself before each Lord's Day that he might be better fitted to bring out their meaning and to lead the worship of his people. The people of our parishes were always glad when he was a reader at our United Service.

The Rev. Dr. Olmstead had the distinction of holding the rectorship of Trinity Church, Branford, twice, being recalled after he had gone from his first rectorship to northern New England. He was a very kind, lovable man, at one time Dean of the Convocation, always trying to be helpful in all the relations into which he came. Of the Rev. Dr. S. J. Horton, the principal of the Academy at Cheshire, one of his old students might write long. Many incidents of his life and work are remembered. He was a graduate of Trinity College and the Alexandria Divinity School. Bringing with him a company of boys who constituted his school at Windham, he established himself at Cheshire near the end of the Civil War, making it a military school and gathering about himself capable teachers, of whom three honored and well-remembered men are living today: Prof. Andrew W. Phillips, of Yale University; Prof. E. D. Woodbury, of Cheshire; and Mr. Thomas H. Fuller, in the service of the Post Office Department at Washington, D. C. I remember well presenting myself in the spring of 1867 to Dr. Horton at the door of the old frame house at the Academy. My chance had come at last to get on towards college, and I have a deep sense of obligation to Dr. Horton and the Diocesan

school. My room was opposite that of Charles A. L. Totten, whose arithmetical calculations in the chronology of the Holy Scripture were afterwards of so much interest. Only this month (April, 1915) I read in an English Church paper that Prof. Totten of Yale University had made calculations (working backward from the present time and forward from the creation), showing that there was a day lost when the sun stood still at Ajalon in Joshua's time—exactly as recorded.

Dr. Horton built up a large school. If he got hold of a parent, especially a mother, he was quite sure to get the boy. He understood boys quite well, even when they thought he did not. When the boys wished to please the Doctor and to obtain a half-holiday, they signed a request to him to print his sermon of the preceding Sunday, in which they declared themselves greatly interested. The request was graciously granted, and there are printed sermons preserved by some of us on special texts, such as: "He went to the head of the waters and cast the salt in there" or "It is not good to eat too much honey." The destruction by fire in 1873 of the group of frame buildings where the boys were housed and fed brought Dr. Horton and the school a hard experience. The Doctor showed great energy and skill in making provision for the school and carrying everything forward, but I have always supposed that the recovery from this disaster was not quite complete. A new building was built, not perhaps ideal in plan and construction. Other schools came into existence with larger endowments and more modern equipment, and increasing age came to the Doctor. It had probably been wiser for him to stand aside from the care of the school after twenty-five years of service, but many of us do not know quite when to give up. All of us who gave Dr. Horton a place of affectionate regard owe a debt to the Rev. Mr. Sexton for all that he did to make the closing years of Dr. Horton's life more comfortable.

During most of my college course in New Haven, I attended St. Thomas' Church. The close relation of Dr. Beardsley, a former principal at the Academy and its most influential trustee made this the most natural choice of a Church home. The growth of the Church in New Haven had warranted a third church in the city proper, and Dr. Beardsley came

from St. Peter's, Cheshire, to organize and carry forward the work. The first name of the Bishop of the Diocese [Thomas Church Brownell] was perpetuated in the name of the new parish, but a bit of pleasantry at the time was that the name "St. Thomas" had been given because of the doubtful prospects of the work—at first. I have heard Dr. Beardsley say that his own desire was that the church should be built on the corner of Orange and Trumbull Streets, which would have been a desirable location as the city grew, making unnecessary the establishment of St. John's later at Eld and State Streets. But many of the people lived on the western side of the city, and so a central location—at first, I think, in Little Orange Street and later in Elm Street—was chosen. Deeply interested in the history and traditions of the Church in Connecticut and having lived close up to the time when the memory of the Fathers was very distinct, he allowed his historical lectures to grow into the larger plan of writing the History of the Church in Connecticut, The Life of Bishop Seabury, The Life of Samuel Johnson, and then the Life of his distinguished son, William Samuel Johnson. His painstaking work in these volumes, as in many historical papers, has made the diocese and all students of our early history his debtors. Dr. Beardsley's wisdom and close relation to the interests of the Diocese made him its most influential presbyter. He presided over the House of Deputies at three General Conventions and was widely known throughout the Church. He commanded the respect and confidence of men throughout the Diocese and in New Haven by his good sense and wise judgment. He was constantly sought as counselor in a great variety of questions. He was deeply interested in the New Haven Colony Historical Society, and he was the advisor of Mr. Philip J. Maret, one of the great benefactors of New Haven. It was felt in his later years that Dr. Beardsley must be associated with every undertaking in the Diocese, with the Academy at Cheshire, with St. Margaret's School at Waterbury; with the Standing Committee, with the General Convention, with the increase of The Bishop's Fund, and with other projects too many to name. He was conservative in his thinking.

Of the Rev. Dr. Edwin Harwood, Rector of Trinity Church from 1859 until

his death, I wish that I might write in an adequate way. When I came to college in 1868, Dr. Harwood was giving informal addresses early Sunday evenings in the Tower Room of Trinity Church, back of the organ, to which little companies of students went. These addresses were suggested by his reading or observation, and were filled with wisdom. I could not name the subjects now, but I do know that they helped a man to think and gave him a new outlook in life. Dr. Harwood in those days gave me a deep interest in the Oxford Movement and in the men especially prominent in it. He had known a good many prominent men in our own Church, and his reminiscences concerning them were of great interest. With him the plan of inviting some of our best known clergymen to preach on Sunday evenings in the winter was perfected. His influence only could have brought men like Phillips Brooks, Bishop Clark, Dr. Alexander Vinton, Dr. Washburne, Bishop Huntington, and Dr. Charles H. Hall to New Haven. After enjoying the privilege of meeting these men I later corresponded with many of them. They were the guests of Dr. Harwood, and one might drop in at the Rectory on Saturday evenings to hear them. Was there ever a more pleasant man to listen to in this way than Bishop Clark?

I could sit in my old place in Trinity Church gallery today and put scores of the laymen of that time in their pews: Mr. Sheffield, Judge Boardman, Dr. Robertson, Governor Harrison, Governor Ingersoll and his brother Colin, Mr. Gardner Morse, Mr. James Mason, Mr. Kirby, Mr. Kidston, Mr. Tuttle, and Mr. Richard Everit—but where shall I stop? After I came to St. Paul's in 1879, I learned to go with the clergy to Dr. Harwood's study on Monday mornings, when a great many questions were beaten out. From his wide reading, observation, and thoughtful study, Dr. Harwood made valuable suggestions for our own time. In the later years of his life, larger recognition came to him in the Diocese. I remember his disappointment at the Baltimore General Convention when the Hymnal went through without detailed discussion, its imperfections uncorrected, perhaps the only way for it to have survived, when so many desired to make changes in it. We made him the head of the delegation at Minneapolis.

He will always be remembered as the founder of our American Church Congress. Great sorrows came to him in the later years of his life, bearing fruit in gentleness of spirit and judgment. I think that all who knew him wished that they might have been of greater help to him.

The Rev. Dr. Hallam, of New London, was an outstanding man, coming to the end of his active work only now as I am writing. He had the historic parish of St. James', New London, and a large place will always be accorded to him in its history. His lectures upon the Prayer Book were widely read and did much for the instruction of his generation. They would be good reading for people today, clergy included, for there has been great loss in knowledge of and appreciation for the book of our common prayer. Dr. Hallam had a sense of humor and preached on some unusual texts, one of them: "Am I a seal or a whale?"—which many think cannot be found in the Bible. The story lingered long in St. Paul's, New Haven, of how, in the old time, his head appeared above the pulpit cushion to announce the text, "How shall Jacob arise for he is small?" He overdid this custom on one occasion. Accompanying Bishop Williams on a visitation in the eastern part of the state and preaching for him, he took the text: "The legs of the lame are not equal," and when the little conformation class presented itself, the first child to appear was a poor little lame girl, who made her way with difficulty to the chancel rail. The last time I saw Dr. Hallam he had come to the Divinity School for the protection of a student from his parish who was under suspicion for plagiarism—for preaching an unusually good sermon. None of the rest of us was ever brought under suspicion in this way, although many of us made unwarranted reputations as good preachers when we were lay readers by going to the drawer in Bishop Williams' writing desk and, by permission, getting one of his sermons on Saturday. I read a great many of them at West Haven in the winter and spring of 1874, and the people accounted me a promising preacher although they ought to have known that I was reading sermons not my own. In the spring of 1874 I read one of the Bishop's sermons on the text, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." When Bishop Williams came for confirmation in No-

vember near All Saints' Day, he preached the same sermon, which was identified because it contained a notable story of St. Polycarp. Everyone remembered it!

Among the faithful servants of the Diocese, high place should be accorded to the Rev. Dr. William Tatlock, for many years Rector of St. John's, Stamford; a member of the Standing Committee; and Secretary of the House of Bishops. With him began the larger life of his own parish in the building of a new church. He was a wise counselor, and his death was a great loss. He was an excellent preacher, always thoughtful and interesting. He was a man of gentle ways, sane in all his thinking and conduct—one whom it does one good to remember.

Of many more men who are gone from us—men to whom the Diocese owes much—I would gladly speak: Mr. Yarrington, long Rector of Christ Church, Greenwich; Dr. Hawley, of Danbury; Mr. Witherspoon, of Derby; Mr. Everest, of the Rectory School in Hamden; Mr. Shannon of Seymour and later of East Haven; Dr. Marble, of Newtown; Dr. Weston, of Stratford; the Rev. Dr. Spencer of South Norwalk, later of Christ Church, New Haven; the Rev. Mr. Fogg, of Windham; the Rev. Henry Townsend, of East Haven. They all live very distinctly in my remembrance, and yet I was not drawn so closely to them as to recall events or traits of character which would interest my hearers.

Dr. Deshon, of Meriden, should be remembered as one of the substantial men, greatly respected in the community and thoroughly trusted for his wisdom in the Diocese. In the group of New Haven rectors, the Rev. Joseph Brewster, of Christ Church, a cultivated and refined man, one full of kindness, the father of Bishop Brewster, is ever to be remembered. The Rev. Dr. Richardson, of St. Paul's, Bridgeport, was noteworthy in his time—a man with whom changes in worship and teaching from the old Connecticut ways found little favor—a man who did not desire to attend retreats and who did not wish them to be held in Bridgeport. He was known as the editor of a quarterly—later a weekly—church paper called The Guardian. His name calls up the vain attempt to maintain a quarterly for the discussion of

our great religious questions. There does not seem to be an interest among us for anything higher than "Shall we change the name of the Church," and it is to be regretted. The Rev. Oliver Y. Prescott was a man who looked at things in the opposite way and had many experiences which belong to a rather narrower phase of the life of the Church. He came back to us and spent the last years of his life here in New Haven as Rector of St. Luke's. Before him at St. Luke's had been the Rev. Dr. Shears, whose school for boys in the upper part of the city will be remembered.

The Rev. Mr. Purves, a very interesting Scotchman who had been at St. Paul's, Woodbury, also came back to New Haven for the last years of his life. The children of St. Paul's Sunday School placed a memorial window for him in the Church of the Ascension. The Rev. Mr. Wilcoxson, who had been associated with Dr. Breck in work in Minnesota, also spent his last years here. The Rev. Hiram Stone, whose last work was at Bantam and Milton in Litchfield County, was the first missionary of the Church in Kansas, supported by St. Paul's Church. New Haven had a good record for interest in these early missionary ventures in the West. With them the names of the Misses Edwards will always be associated. Most of our parishes had scholarships in the Western Mission fields, and the Missionary Bishops came back to see us frequently.

In New Haven, the name of the Rev. George Brinley Morgan, under whom Christ Church came into its large building and place, will ever be remembered. His sudden death touched the hearts of all. None felt that his work had been quite done. Many years before, in the death of the Rev. Mr. Tremaine, of St. John's Church in this city, we had also been made to feel that a good and useful life had been prematurely cut short. I would like to write in here in this connection the name of the Rev. Prof. Edwin E. Johnson, of Trinity Church and Trinity College, Hartford, whose death took from us a man of peculiar gifts.

There is another list of names of men who seemed younger than those mentioned—because they lived longer and have only just now gone from us: the Rev. Peter Shepherd, of Clinton; the Rev. John Townsend; the Rev. E. L. Wit-

combe, formerly of North Haven and Brookfield; the Rev. Mr. French, of Darien; the Rev. Mr. Wildman, of Wallingford; the Rev. Prof. Micou, of Waterbury and later of the Alexandria Seminary; the greatly loved Dr. Andrews, of New Haven and later of Guilford. Very gentle thoughts come to many of us when these names are mentioned. They were fellow-laborers with us.

I am well aware how fragmentary what I have presented to you is. I know how little proportion is indicated in my paper. Another writer would recall different incidents in the lives of these men and would give larger space to some whose names have been merely mentioned. I am, of course, only trying to call back the men whom I knew and with whom I was associated in one or another way. They are to me a most interesting group of men, and it does me good to think of them, though I know that I cannot make them live for you in the same way. They nonetheless deserve any effort to recall their lives and work to this generation. It may be that someone else, appreciating the imperfect character of this paper, may present his own reminiscences, and for this I would be thankful.

I have not tried to write from a critical standpoint, making an estimate of the character and work of these men. The more one thinks of them the less he thinks of their limitations and the more he thinks of their goodness and usefulness. They were all devoted servants of the Diocese and the Church, and nearly all stood for a great deal in the communities in which they lived: for good religion, good morals, good manners, and good learning. They helped to maintain good traditions in Connecticut when so many influences to destroy them were beginning to appear. From them, the great multitude of men and women received instruction in holy things and were comforted in trouble. You will observe that those who are most distinctly remembered are those who stayed long in their parishes.

We all ask now and then how such men as I have named compare in efficiency with the men who have succeeded them in the work of the Church today. This generation is disposed to think of them as narrow in their outlook,

limited in their ideas, within the range of old traditions, conservative (if not reactionary), not appreciative of the new forces at work in the world. Such a conclusion is hardly warranted. For their time they probably did as well as we are doing today. There were not many great preachers among them, but they did bring a message out of the Holy Scriptures for their people which fed their souls and directed their conduct. I do not suppose their sermons would command a hearing today, with the new interests which have come into human life. But most of them took pains with their sermons; if they were heavy and dry, they had not the defects of extemporaneous talks upon current topics. The writers studied their Bibles with the help of old-fashioned commentaries and probably with greater thought of the original languages than their successors.

I have the impression that the older clergy averaged better readers of the services than will be found in our churches today. There may have been something of declamation in their reading, but they read so as to be understood. Many read over the service with care in their studies before reading it in the church, and so tried to bring out the meaning. The foolish practise of singing the services which has bewitched the younger men, leaving them poor singers and worse readers, had not become common. It is hard for me to see how so many of the clergy should be willing to expose their feeble powers of singing or intoning to their congregations. I am sure that the common worship, which has been the glory and strength of this Church, was better maintained than it is today. People were better instructed in the use of the Prayer Book, and they valued and used the privilege of Common Worship. Our congregations today are too willing to leave the services for the minister and the choir, and silence reigns in the nave of the Church.

That better pastoral work was done in the old time than now I fully believe. It is a great loss to the Church that the clergy do not, by visiting homes, establish the relation of personal friendship with their people—something more than an official relation. Great parishes in this Diocese were built up by faithful pastoral work. The multiplication of services and the direction of many parochial organizations by the

rector in his office will never make up for the personal ministration from house to house such as went on in most of our parishes a generation or two ago. I have heard the clergy say that they were not going to run their legs off visiting their people, and people who do not go to Church. And I think I observe that the parishioners of such rectors cease to run or walk to hear them. I have the impression that the declaration of the Psalmist ("The Lord delighteth not in any man's legs") may be qualified in the case of the clergy who use them in parochial visiting and in searching for possible parishioners. The clergy of the old time surely did know their people. It is said that Dr. Vibbert, on Monday mornings, used to start out to visit those whom he had missed in Church on the previous day.

In saying all this, I am not unmindful of the great changes which have come to country and city alike. The minister has not now his peculiar position as one of the few educated men in the community; his message has a rival in the multiplication of books and periodicals. The multitude of newcomers has changed the character of the population of every town and city. The old-fashioned layman, with the parish as his main interest in life, has largely gone. A new adjustment must be made for a ministry to newcomers, and many of them in this generation will hold no Church relation with us. The people are not living in their own homes year after year in such numbers as they were. The apartment houses and frequent changes make parish work more difficult. The janitor and the speaking-tube have the nature of non-conductors and increase the difficulty of making people understand that the minister is not canvassing for something. Men have long been finding in societies and clubs a substitute for church, and now the women are doing likewise. Life is crowded with new interests, which absorb time and money and which distract attention. The net must be cast in new directions and in new ways by "fishers of men." A readjustment is being made, and we are all called to some share in the endeavor to lift the Church of God to meet the new conditions. We have been thinking at this time of a group of devoted and faithful men who did their duty well in their own time and who left us a good inheritance. It must be our endeavor to meet the needs

of the time and leave a record as fair as that which has been today recalled.
 [From a manuscript in the Diocesan Archives.]

NORWICH, June 20th, 1848.

REV. AND DEAR SIR :—The cost of the proposed Monument to the memory of BISHOP SEABURY, having been ascertained, the undersigned beg leave to submit the following mode of providing for it in the Diocese.

Two hundred and fifty dollars, have already been received or pledged, and the additional amount required to fill the estimate, can be realized by the payment of twelve and a half cents, on the part of each communicant in the several parishes.

Making this small sum the basis of contribution, we earnestly desire you, dear Sir, to collect, and as early as possible, to transmit to the Treasurer of the fund, that portion which may justly be expected from your parish in this ratio, and according to the number of communicants reported by you to the Bishop at the late Convention.

We are happy to inform you, that the Committee appointed for the purpose, have obtained from a distinguished Architect, a simple but most appropriate design for the aforesaid memorial—it being an ALTAR TOMB, canopied, and affixed to the Eastern chancel wall.

We may also add, that the noble edifice in which this memorial is to be erected, will be ready to receive the same at no very distant day, and, consequently, that the Committee cannot be too speedily furnished with the means for its construction.

Very truly, your obedient servants,

WILLIAM F. MORGAN,
 WILLIAM JARVIS,
 RICHARD ADAMS,

REV. WM. JARVIS,
 Portland, Middlesex Co., Ct. } *Treasurer of the Fund.*

At a Convention of Clergymen and Lay Deputies, of the Protestant EPISCOPAL CHURCH in the United States of America, held in New-York, October 6th and 7th, 1784 :—Present as follows ;

Rev. SAMUEL PARKER, A. M. Massachusetts and Rhode-Island.

Rev. JOHN R. MARSHAL, A. M. Connecticut.

N E W - Y O R K ,

Rev. SAMUEL PROVOOST, A. M.
 Rev. ABRAHAM BEACH, A. M.
 Rev. BENJAMIN MOORE, A. M.
 Rev. JOSHUA BLOOMER, A. M.
 Rev. LEONARD CUTTING, A. M.

Rev. THOMAS MOORE,
 Hon. JAMES DUANE,
 MARINUS WILLET, } Esquires.
 JOHN ALSOP,

N E W - J E R S E Y ,

Rev. UZAL OGDEN,
 JOHN DE HART, Esquire,

JOHN CHETWOOD, Esquire,
 Mr. SAMUEL SPRAGG.

P E N N S Y L V A N I A ,

Rev. WILLIAM WHITE, D. D.
 Rev. SAMUEL MAGAW, D. D.
 Rev. JOSEPH HUTCHINS, A. M.
 MATTHEW CLARKSON, Esquire.

RICHARD WILLING, } Esquires.
 SAMUEL POWELL,
 RICHARD PETERS,

D E L A W A R E S T A T E ,

Rev. SYDENHAM THORN, Rev. CHARLES WHARTON, Mr. ROBERT CLAY.

M A R Y L A N D .

Rev. WILLIAM SMITH. D. D.

N. B. The Rev. Mr. GRIFFITH, from the State of Virginia, was present by Permission. The Clergy of that State being restricted by Laws yet in force there, were not at liberty to send Delegates, or consent to any Alterations in the Order, Government, Doctrine, or Worship of the Church.

[Continued over]

THE Body now assembled, recommend to the Clergy and Congregations of their Communion in the States represented as above, and propose to those of the other States not represented, That as soon as they shall have organized or associated themselves in the States to which they respectively belong, agreeably to such Rules as they shall think proper, they unite in a general ecclesiastical Constitution, on the following fundamental Principles.

- I. That there shall be a general Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.
- II. That the Episcopal Church in each State, send Deputies to the Convention, consisting of Clergy and Laity.
- III. That associated Congregations in two or more States, may send Deputies jointly.
- IV. That the said Church shall maintain the Doctrines of the Gospel as now held by the Church of England, and shall adhere to the Liturgy of the said Church as far as shall be consistent with the American Revolution, and the Constitutions of the respective States.
- V. That in every State where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, he shall be considered as a Member of the Convention, *ex Officio*.
- VI. That the Clergy and Laity assembled in Convention, shall deliberate in one Body, but shall vote seperately; and the Concurrence of both shall be necessary to give Validity to every Measure.
- VII. That the first Meeting of the Convention shall be at *Philadelphia*, the Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael next; to which it is hoped, and earnestly desired, That the Episcopal Churches in the respective States, will send their Clerical and Lay Deputies, duly instructed and authorized to proceed on the necessary Business herein proposed for their Deliberation.

Signed by Order of the Convention,

WILLIAM SMITH, D. D. *President.*

